

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

Price 23s. net. Yearly subscription 35s. net, post free. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 60s. net, post free

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Editors* C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warrington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	
<i>With the co-operation of</i>	
Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,	
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and	
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton	

*New Series*      *Volume VIII, Nos. 3, 4*      *December 1958*

## CONTENTS

Sophocles, <i>O.T.</i> 222-35	B. R. REES 201
A note on the <i>Bacchae</i>	K. O'NOLAN 204
An inscription from Mesambria	J. D. BEAZLEY 206
Horace, <i>Odes</i> i. 32. 15-16	G. W. WILLIAMS 208
Pliny, <i>N.H.</i> ii. 22	B. R. REES 213
Mam. Scaurus cites precedent	E. BADIAN 216
Sophocles, <i>Philoctetes</i> , 782	R. H. PHILP 220
Plato, <i>Symposium</i> 195 D, E	D. S. ROBERTSON 221
Theophrastus, <i>Περὶ λίθων</i> 25	D. E. EICHHOLZ 221
The Earths of Theophrastus	R. H. S. ROBERTSON 222

## REVIEWS:

*Liricos Griegos*, i (Adrados), D. I. PAGE, 223; *Die Hesiodfragmente auf Papyrus* (Merkelbach), D. MERVYN JONES, 226; *Die 'Pandorasage' bei Hesiod* (Lendle), H. J. ROSE, 228; *Oedipus at Thebes* (Knox), *Sophocle (Méautis)*, D. W. LUCAR, 229; *Aristote, Les Parties des Animaux* (Louis), D. J. FURLEY, 233; *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes* (Newiger), E. J. DOVER, 235; *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, i (Edmonds), D. MERVYN JONES, 237; *The Open Society and its Enemies* (Popper), J. TATE, 241; *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, i. i (Ziegler), D. A. RUSSELL, 242; *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, i (Walbank), H. H. SCULLARD, 243; *Das mathematische Denken der Antike* (Becker), I. DULMER-THOMAS, 245; *Zwei Untersuchungen zur antiken Logik* (Becker), J. B. TREVARKE, 246; *Horatius, Oden und Epoden, Briefe* (Kiesling-Heinze-Burck), L. F. WILKINSON, 248; *Il Problema della Composizione dell' Eneide* (D'Anna), M. L. CLARKE, 250; *Catalogue of the MSS. of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Munati), E. J. KENNEY, 252; *Studio sulla satira di Giovenale* (Serafini), E. J. KENNEY, 254; *Der Briefwechsel des L. Munatius Plancus mit Cicero* (Walser), W. S. WATT, 256; *God and Fate in Livy* (Kajanto), A. H. McDONALD, 257; *Cronologia dei "Dialoghi" di Seneca* (Giancotti), L. D. REYNOLDS, 258; *Taciti Germania, Agricola, Dialogus* (Koestermann), R. H. MARTIN, 260; *Augustine, City of God*, i (McCracken), R. L. GREENSLADE, 261; *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine* (Kleberg), E. J. KENNEY, 262; *Études*

[Continued on p. 3 of cover]





# The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

† W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

† E. CAPP, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, M.A.

E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

*Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

## NEW VOLUMES, 1958

### LATIN

309. CICERO, *Pro Sestio, In Vatinius*.

447. CICERO, *Pro Caelio, De Provinciis Consularibus, Pro Balbo*. Translated by R. Gardner.

404. LIVY. Fourteen volumes, volume XIV, Fragments of Books. Translated by A. C. Schlesinger; general index, prepared by R. M. Geer.

### GREEK

446. AELIAN. On the Characteristics of Animals. Three volumes, Volume I, Books I-V. Translated by A. F. Scholfield.

421. CALLIMACHUS. *Fragments*. Translated by C. A. Trypanis.

405. PLUTARCH. *Moralia*. 15 volumes, Vol. VII. Translated by P. H. De Lacy and B. Einarson.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

## Greece and Isles of Greece Cruises

Reservations, tickets, etc., from representatives ASSOCIATION OF STEAMSHIP OWNERS OF GREECE maintaining services in the Mediterranean and isles of Greece and coastal ports

**Teachers and students 20% to 30% rebate**

### MEMBERS:

HELLENIC MEDITERRANEAN LINES  
TYPALDOS LINES · EPIROTIKY LINE  
KAVOUNIDES LINE · FOUSTANOUS LINE  
SIGALAS LINE · NOMIKOS LINES · NEW  
EPIROTIKY LINE · EVAN TOYAS LINE  
DIAPOULIS LINE · LATSIS LINE · IONIAN LINE

## Handbook to Greece— Turkey, Cyprus and Malta with Hellenic self-taught section

36 illustrations, plans and map, 12s. 6d.  
plus postage 1s. 10d.

The ideal companion-guide for intending travellers. Most reasonably priced for the wealth of information it contains when compared to others.

This is what Mr. Pierre d'Harcourt, the well-known travel correspondent of the *Sunday Observer*, has to say about this handbook: 'The most practical guide book to Greece that I know.'

*Book through your travel agent or*

## OCEANWAYS STEAMSHIP AGENCY LTD.

23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus, London, S.W. 1

Phones: TRAFalgar 6055-56

Cables: Dakoglo

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Editors* C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	
<i>With the co-operation of</i>	
Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,	
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and	
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton	

*New Series*      *Volume VIII, Nos. 3, 4*      *December 1958*

## CONTENTS

Sophocles, <i>O.T.</i> 222-35	B. R. REES 201
A note on the <i>Bacchae</i>	K. O'HOLAN 204
An inscription from Mesambria	J. D. SEAZLEY 206
Horace, <i>Odes</i> i. 32. 15-16	G. W. WILLIAMS 208
Pliny, <i>N.H.</i> ii. 22	B. R. REES 213
Mam. Scaurus cites precedent	E. NADIAN 216
Sophocles, <i>Philoctetes</i> , 782	R. H. PHILP 220
Plato, <i>Symposium</i> 195 D, E	D. S. ROBERTSON 221
Theophrastus, <i>Περὶ λίθων</i> 25	D. E. EICHHOLZ 221
The Earths of Theophrastus	R. H. S. ROBERTSON 222

## REVIEWS:

*Liricae Graecae*, i (Adrados), D. I. PAGE, 223; *Die Heroidenfragmente auf Papyrus* (Merkelbach), D. MERVYN JONES, 226; *Die 'Pandorasage' bei Hesiod* (Lendle), H. J. ROSE, 228; *Oedipus at Thebes* (Knox), *Sophocles* (McAuliffe), D. W. LUCAS, 229; *Aristotle, Les Parties des Animaux* (Lévy), D. J. FURLEY, 233; *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes* (Newiger), K. J. DOVER, 235; *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, i (Edmonds), D. MERVYN JONES, 237; *The Open Society and its Enemies* (Popper), J. TATE, 241; *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, i. i (Ziegler), D. A. RUSSELL, 242; *A Historical Commentary on Ptolemy*, i (Walbank), H. H. SCULLARD, 243; *Des mathematische Denken der Antike* (Becker), I. BULMER-THOMAS, 245; *Zwei Untersuchungen zur antiken Logik* (Becker), J. R. TREYKIN, 246; *Horatius, Oden und Epoden, Briefe* (Kleinling-Henrich-Burck), L. P. WILKINSON, 248; *Il Problema della Composizione dell' 'Eneide'* (D'Anna), M. L. CLARKE, 250; *Catalogus of the MSS. of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Münster), E. J. KENNEDY, 252; *Studia sulla satira di Giovenale* (Serafini), E. J. KENNEDY, 254; *Der Briefwechsel des L. Mammius Plautus mit Cicero* (Walser), W. C. WATT, 256; *God and Fate in Lirio* (Kajanto), A. H. McDONALD, 257; *Cronologia dei "Dialoghi" di Seneca* (Giacchetti), L. D. REYNOLDS, 258; *Taciti Germania, Agricola, Dialogus* (Königsmann), R. H. MARTIN, 260; *Augustine, City of God*, i (McCracken), S. L. GREENGLASS, 261; *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets de l'antiquité romaine* (Kleberg), E. J. KENNEDY, 262; *Études*

(Continued on p. 3 of cover)



## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. † W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

† E. CAPP, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

*Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net.*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

### NEW VOLUMES, 1958

#### LATIN

309. CICERO, *Pro Sestio, In Vatinius*.  
447. CICERO. *Pro Caelio, De Provinciis Consularibus, Pro Balbo*. Translated by R. Gardner.  
404. LIVY. Fourteen volumes, volume XIV. Fragments of Books. Translated by A. C. Schlesinger; general index, prepared by R. M. Geer.

#### GREEK

446. AELIAN. *On the Characteristics of Animals*. Three volumes, Volume I, Books I-V. Translated by A. F. Scholfield.  
421. CALLIMACHUS. *Fragments*. Translated by C. A. Trypanis.  
405. PLUTARCH. *Moralia*. 15 volumes, Vol. VII. Translated by P. H. De Lacy and B. Einarson.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

## Greece and Isles of Greece Cruises

Reservations, tickets, etc., from representatives  
**ASSOCIATION OF  
STEAMSHIP OWNERS OF  
GREECE** maintaining services in the  
Mediterranean and isles of Greece and  
coastal ports

**Teachers and students 20% to  
30% rebate**

#### MEMBERS:

HELLENIC MEDITERRANEAN LINES  
TYPALDOS LINES • EPIROTIKY LINE  
KAVOUNIDES LINE • FOUSTANOUS LINE  
SIGALAS LINE • NOMIKOS LINES • NEW  
EPIROTIKY LINE • EVAN TOYAS LINE  
DIAFOULIS LINE • LATSIS LINE • IONIAN LINE

## Handbook to Greece— Turkey, Cyprus and Malta with Hellenic self-taught section

36 illustrations, plans and map, 12s. 6d.  
plus postage 1s. 10d.

The ideal companion-guide for intending  
travellers. Most reasonably priced for  
the wealth of information it contains  
when compared to others.

This is what Mr. Pierre d'Harcourt, the  
well-known travel correspondent of the  
*Sunday Observer*, has to say about this  
handbook: 'The most practical guide  
book to Greece that I know.'

*Book through your travel agent or*

**OCEANWAYS STEAMSHIP AGENCY LTD.**

23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus, London, S.W. 1

Phones: TRAFalgar 6055-56

Cables: Dakoglu

**Catalogues gratis**  
**Large or small collections bought**

**Telephone 58351**

**BASIL BLACKWELL**



## Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)

E. BADIAN

The typically Roman *clientela*—that relationship between the weaker and the stronger which became the pattern of Rome's relations with weaker foreign states—is discussed in this study, which shows how *clientela* held the Empire together in the difficult times of the Late Republic. 50s. net

## Grain-Mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity

L. A. MORITZ

The author, reviewing the milling implements of Greece and Rome, argues that one of the two fundamental changes in the grain-mill—the invention of the rotary mill—took place in classical antiquity, at a time much later than is commonly believed. In dealing with the meal and flour used for bread, he includes a detailed analysis of the relevant evidence in the eighteenth book of Pliny's Natural History. *Illustrated.* 50s. net

## Textual Criticism

P. MAAS

This translation should be welcomed in England, where there is at present no serious work on the principles of textual criticism. It is written with the literature of ancient Greece and Rome mainly in mind. 12s. 6d. net

OXFORD CLASSICAL TEXTS

## M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae

### Volume III

Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem. Commentariolum Petitionis.  
Epistulae ad M. Brutum. Fragmenta Epistularum.

*A new text edited by W. S. WATT.* 21s. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



# HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

## 1959 Hellenic Cruises

Under the Patronage of the Vice-Chancellors of  
Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, and Wales Universities

### **Cruise No. 14 GREECE LIBYA, TURKEY, & YUGOSLAVIA**

**1 April to 17 April 1959**

Visiting VENICE, DELPHI, OSIOS LOUKAS, SPARTA, MISTRA, DERNIA, CYRENE, KNOSSOS, GORTYNA, PHAESTOS, RHODES, LINDOS, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, SELJUK, EPHEUS or PRIENE, ATHENS, DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, SOUNION, DELOS, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

### **Cruise No. 15 YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, AND TURKEY**

**8 August to 21 August 1959**

Visiting VENICE, DUBROVNIK, CORFU, PALAIOCASTRITSA, DELPHI, OSIOS LOUKAS, DELOS, MYKONOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIPOLI, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, SKYROS, ATHENS, DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, OLYMPIA, VENICE.

### **Cruise No. 16**

### **GREECE AND TURKEY**

**19 August to 3 September 1959**

Visiting VENICE, NIKOPOUS, JANNINA, DODONA, CORINTH, MYCENAE, TIRYNS, EPIDAUROS, KNOSSOS, SANTORINI, RHODES, LINDOS, SELJUK, EPHEUS, THASSOS, KAVALLA, PHILLIPI, VOLOS, MOUNT PILION, SKIATHOS, DELOS, TINOS, SYROS, ATHENS, DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, SOUNION, DELPHI, VENICE.

### **Cruise No. 17**

### **GREECE, TURKEY, AND YUGOSLAVIA**

**1 September to 16 September 1959**

Visiting VENICE, DELPHI, DELOS, PAROS, SKIATHOS, SKOPELOS, THASSOS, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, TROY, SAMOTHRAKI, SAMOS, TIGANI, PATMOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, SOUNION, EPIDAUROS, TIRYNS, MYCENAE, CORINTH, LOUTRAKI, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

Each Cruise will be accompanied by five Classical Scholars  
who will give Lectures on Board and at various Sites visited.

#### **Guest Lecturers accompanying Cruises include**

Sir Maurice Bowra, Mr. John Dancy, Mr. R. A. Fletcher, Mr. D. E. L. Haynes, Mrs. Sybille E. Haynes, Sir Julian Huxley, Miss Kathleen Kenyon, Mr. F. Kinchin Smith, Mr. Michael MacLagan, Rev. A. G. Guy C. Pentreath, Professor W. E. Stanford, Sir John Summerson, Mr. G. A. D. Tait, Rev. Lawrence Waddy, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Sir John Wolfenden.

## **PRICES FROM 80 GUINEAS**

INCLUDING TRAVEL LONDON-VENICE AND RETURN

*For full particulars and reservations apply to*

**W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.**

**260 (M34) Tottenham Court Road, London, W. 1**

Telephone: MUSeum 8070 (12 lines)

# The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME VIII NOS: 3-4

(VOLUME LXXII OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1958

## SOPHOCLES, *O.T.* 222-35

OEDIPUS' 'great cursing speech' begins with a brief introduction in which he expresses sympathy with the people of Thebes and urges them in their own interest to co-operate with him in exposing the murderer of Laius. There follow his command to denounce the murderer (222-35) and his curse on the murderer (236-48), τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον in 236 picking up ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τίνος in 225. The traditional view as to the logical arrangement of the first of these sections (222-35) may be found in Jebb; though his text differs in certain particulars from that of the majority of editors, the interpretation of the passage as a whole remains unaffected. 'The cases contemplated in the proclamation (223-35)', he writes, 'are (1) a Theban denouncing another Theban, (2) a *Theban denouncing himself*, (3) a Theban denouncing an alien.'<sup>1</sup> (The italics are mine.) Most editors and commentators would appear to be in broad agreement with this arrangement, however much they may disagree with Jebb and amongst themselves about the text of 227-8 and other points of detail.

One cannot help thinking, however, that preoccupation with the text and meaning of 227-8 has caused at least one clear pointer to be overlooked: the correlative clauses introduced by the particles μέν and δέ suggest not divisions which are logically parallel or antithetical to the clause preceding them but rather qualifications or conditions affecting it. Thus, the logical structure which one would expect to find here is: first, in 224-6, a general instruction, then, in 227-9 and 230-5, considerations which might make it undesirable for the potential informer to comply with this instruction. In fact the second δ' αὖ clause (233-5) is clearly not a further consideration to be dealt with but a complete negation of the instruction as a whole, so that the arrangement would be, not, as has usually been held hitherto, (1) 224-6, (2) 227-9, (3) 230-2, (4) 233-5, but (i) 224-6, (i) (a) 227-9, (i) (b) 230-2, (ii) 233-5. (i) would lay down the general instruction to denounce the murderer, (i) (a) and (b) would deal with considerations which might hinder compliance with this instruction, and (ii) would then contemplate an out-and-out refusal to co-operate and lead up to the detail of the action to be taken against the criminal when eventually detected.

It follows that, as (i) (b) deals with one objection to informing against the criminal, viz. the possibility that he may be a foreigner, (i) (a) may reasonably be expected to dispose of another and so not to refer after all to *self*-denunciation. If we re-examine the traditional view, we find that this idea that the

<sup>1</sup> Sheppard's arrangement is substantially the same as Jebb's, though his anxiety to get rid of the awkward alien apparently leads him to omit mention of him from (3).

section contains a reference to *self*-denunciation is based on two foundations: the *αὐτὸς καθ' αὐτοῦ* of 228 and the parenthesis in 228-9. Taking the latter first, we may forbear for the moment to extract from it an apodosis to the protasis of 227-8, which seems to be a measure of desperation, and consider whether it could fairly be said to describe the ultimate fate of the criminal after denouncing himself. The words γῆς δ' ἄπεισιν ἀβλαβής might at first sight appear to relate to the banishment which Oedipus promises the detected murderer in 236 ff. But, when one has read on and realized the implications of Oedipus' curse with its total and final exclusion of the criminal from all the social and religious rights of a citizen, concluding as it does with the imprecation, pronounced with all the authority of a king, κακὸν κεκάσιν ἄμωρον ἐκτρέψαι βίον, one may well doubt the correctness of applying to such a fate the trite euphemism πέισεται . . . οὐδέν; it is a fate to which death itself might seem preferable, as it does in fact to Oedipus himself in the Exodos (cf. 1486 ff.). It may be objected that in the parenthesis Oedipus seeks to *differentiate* between the fate of a self-confessed murderer and one detected on the evidence of others; against this is the undoubted fact that the murderer is, and remains, a *μίασμα*, whether he confesses or is found out, and that the mode of his unmasking can have no effect upon the degree of his pollution of his country. Confession here has no merit except to bring into the open the responsibility for the crime and thus enable the authorities to speed up the appropriate measures which must be taken to rid Thebes of the pollution and which are in the nature of things invariable, social ostracism and expulsion or execution. The evidence for a reference to *self*-denunciation assumed to be present in the parenthesis is, to say the least, inconclusive; if one accepts it, one is forced to admit that the whole of the curse (235-51) is intended to apply only to those who fail to comply with the king's command, as he visualizes in 233-5. Needless to say, the converse is not true.

The consideration of the phrase *αὐτὸς καθ' αὐτοῦ* involves a re-examination of the text of 227-8 and, in particular, of the word *ὑπεφελών*, the reading of the manuscripts. A glance at Jebb's Appendix is sufficient to show how strenuously, yet vainly, editors and commentators have laboured to make sense of the received text. Their uncertainty as to its meaning and construction has entangled them in every kind of problem: how to punctuate the line, whether to supply the verb of the apodosis and, if so, whence to supply it, whether *αὐτὸς καθ' αὐτοῦ* is part of that apodosis or of the protasis, and so on. Nor is the feeling of dissatisfaction, with which, despite all their labours, one is left, relieved by Jebb's drastic alteration of *αὐτὸς* into *αὐτόν* (sc. *σημαίνοντα*) or Hartung's emendation to *ὑπεξίτω*. In fine, not one of the suggested renderings of 227-8, whether based on the manuscripts' *ὑπεφελών* or Blaydes's *ὑπεφελείν*, or on more sweeping emendations, seems convincing, and the editors of L.S.J. typify the general chaos when, after trying valiantly to make something of the Oxford text, they conclude by adding, more hopefully than helpfully, that 'other explanations are given in Jebb's commentary'.

The verb *ὑπεφαιεῖν* has a derivative meaning which no one could seriously question: 'to take from, away from, away from under, secretly, gradually', and this meaning, in one or other of its shades, is always present in the active voice. In a few passages this more general meaning takes on a rather specialized sense 'to drain, draw away', as in Soph. *El.* 1420 and Plut. *Mor.* 127 c (Teubner ii, ed. Bernardakis). The pairing of *ὑπεφαιεῖν* with *ἀντλεῖν* in the Plutarch

passage in such a way as to be almost synonymous is very suggestive, when we recall the metaphorical use of ἀντλεῖν; in Eur. *Hipp.* 633 ὑπεξελών is used in exactly the same metaphorical sense as ἀντλεῖ in Soph. *El.* 1290-1, and ἄλβον δωμάτων ὑπεξελών should be rendered 'having drained away the wealth of his house', *pace* L.S.J.<sup>1</sup> But it would be straining the point to extend its metaphorical sense to the present passage: you can drain away ἄλβος but hardly an ἐπὶ κλημα. On the other hand, a comparison between the use of ὑπεξαίρειν in the Sophocles passage just quoted and that in, for example, Thuc. iv. 83. 3 and Plat. *Rep.* 567 b illustrates the difficulty in drawing a hard-and-fast distinction between the different senses of the verb in different contexts—so much seems to depend on the exact force of the prefix ὑπό.

There can be no doubt, then, that, though a hard word to pin down to a precise meaning in every context, ὑπεξαίρειν always bears the basic sense of 'remove'. There is surely no justification for distorting its meaning here, as most have done, in order to produce an interpretation of the section as a whole which is unsupported by the logical structure of the passage and its own internal arrangement. We are entitled to extract from the ὑπεξελεῖν of the Oxford text only the sense of 'remove' in the first instance and to render: 'Even if he is afraid to remove the charge by his own action (thus bringing it) against himself'. To the question 'remove from whom?', we reply, 'Obviously, from the murderer, who has just been referred to in the preceding clause'. There is a near-parallel in Thuc. iv. 83. 3; there it is the other person, Perdiccas, who is expressly mentioned (in the *dativus commodi*); here he is omitted, leaving us to supply τῷ δεδρακότι or, more simply, ἐκείνῳ from the ἀνδρός of 225—the idea that we might supply τῇ πόλει is not acceptable, since the charge cannot be said to be directed against the city.

This explanation seems to me at least not inferior to any proposed hitherto; if it is accepted, the rest of the section falls readily into place, for the apodosis is naturally supplied from μὴ σιωπάτω in 231 or, failing that, σημαίνειν in 226, i.e. σημαίνεται. But this is still to accept ὑπεξελεῖν, an emendation necessitated in the first place by a failure to understand the passage as a whole and to translate and construe ὑπεξελών. By a slight shift of emphasis the participle can be made to fit into the clause as now explained as well as, if not better than, the infinitive—for why should not the accusative be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both verbs? We might then paraphrase: 'Even if he fears the charge, when he has removed it by his own action from the culprit and brought it down upon himself.' Only a slight compression of thought is involved. It is even possible, though I should hesitate to press the suggestion, that Sophocles had in mind here something of the metaphorical sense of the verb, viz. 'having drawn it off and down on himself'. It is just conceivable, then, that the participle is, after all, right.

Oedipus was trying, in 227-9, to meet an anticipated objection which a potential informer might make: that denunciation of the murderer might incriminate himself as an accessory before or after the fact. He endeavoured to do this by reassuring his hearers that, if denunciation of the murderer revealed that the informer was, in some way, privy to the deed, the punishment would be limited to exile—it is not clear whether temporary or permanent. This

<sup>1</sup> Murray's suggestion ὑπεξελών is presumably formed on analogy with the rare and usually late examples of ἀνελῶ, διελῶ,

and καθελῶ, cited in L.S.J. (cf. ἐλεῖ in some manuscripts of Ar. *Lys.* 542), and, though convenient, is not justifiable.



interpretation might help with the solution of two further problems. First, the *τοῖσδ'* of 251, which I believe to have been generally misunderstood. The curse which Oedipus pronounces is specifically aimed at the murderer in 236 ff., but all those who fail to comply with his command will face its consequences. That, surely, is the meaning of the plural *τοῖσδ'*, not that it is a further indication of Oedipus' obsession with *ἡγοραί* (cf. 124, which seems to suggest the opposite); rather it is a reminder that the imprecation is upon all who, though they know the identity of the criminal, fail to assist in unmasking him, including even the king himself. In the vague *τοῖσδ'* Oedipus embraces all for whose warning he has uttered 222-35, returning to a more precise *ὑμῖν* in 252.

Secondly, the words which Oedipus employs in meeting possible objections, as well as the substance of those objections, suggest that his mind is now pre-occupied with the suspicion, already hinted at in 124-5 (cf. 247) and soon to be brought into the open in the quarrels with Tiresias and Creon, that it was collusion which had caused the death of Laius and it might soon be directed, if it was not already being directed, against himself. Hence, the reference to an alien in 230 is not so unexpected: Oedipus, suspicious of an internal plot, is beginning to think in terms of external agents. Nor does the phraseology in any way imply that the foreigner is living abroad at the moment; indeed, both the statement of Creon (96-98) and dramatic effect demand the opposite. It is the dramatic effect of these lines which must have counted most with Sophocles: his main purpose, when he wrote them, must have been to enhance still further the irony of a speech already deeply imbued with it. A simple emendation (*δντ'* for *τόν* in 231) would relieve the awkwardness of the syntax, but, when all has been said and done by way of exegesis of the text, the fact remains that it is the character and predicament of Oedipus which make this speech a dramatic crux of the play, not the tidiness of its grammar or rhetoric.<sup>1</sup>

University College, Cardiff

R. R. REES

### A NOTE ON THE *BACCHAE*

ONE of the most notable of Euripidean 'escape prayers' occurs in the *Bacchae* at ll. 402-75. There the followers of Dionysus long to escape the persecution of Pentheus by being transported to Cyprus, Paphos, or Pieria. It may seem natural that the bacchanals should think of Cyprus, the home of Aphrodite, in view of her general association with their own god's cult, and Pieria, the home of the muses, apart from its Bacchic associations, would have been a natural choice of the poet as a glorifying compliment to Archelaus, his Macedonian patron. At any rate, whatever the reasons, there is no doubt that Pieria and Cyprus were the choices of the bacchanals, for both places are qualified in the Euripidean manner by vivid descriptive phrases (*Κύπρον, νᾶσον τὰς Ἀφροδίτας, ἐν' οἷ θελξίφρονες νέμονται θνατοῖσιν* 'Ερωτες: οὐ δ' ἄ καλλιστευομένα Πιερία μούσεος ἔδρα, σερμὰ κλιτὸς Ὀλύμπου, etc.).

The problem of the passage is the middle choice, Paphos. Firstly, it is already implied in the mention of Cyprus, and it is further qualified as 'being fertilized

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Professor H. D. Westlake and Dr. W. J. N. Rudd for discussing with me my draft of this note. They bear no responsibility for my views.



rainlessly by the foreign stream of a hundred mouths' (*Πάφον θ' ἂν ἑκατόστομοι βαρβάρου ποταμοῦ ῥοαὶ καρπίζουσιν ἄνομβροι*). There can be little doubt that this description represents the Nile.<sup>1</sup> Attempts to explain the passage either deny that the Nile is meant or try to show how it is linked up with Paphos. Neither of these solutions can carry much conviction. For example, Paley's theory that the Nile mud was carried out to sea as far as Paphos seems as far-fetched as its Nile mud. Cyprus itself would be a better mark for such a descriptive qualification, which indeed loses its meaning if Carpathus or even Crete, by reason of their latitude, may share in the distant river's bounty. Professor Dodds (p. 118) in dealing with these theories suggests an alternative, that Euripides may be reporting an ancient version of a present-day peasant belief that the many springs of Cyprus are fed not by local rain but by water which has passed under the sea. The belief is attested as far back as 1816. However, as he points out, ancient evidence for the belief, and specifically in regard to Nile water, is lacking. Also the description would apply with more propriety to Cyprus as a whole rather than to Paphos.

In his edition Professor Dodds has neatly classified the attempts at emendation under three heads: (1) elimination of Paphos, (2) elimination of the Nile, and (3) separation of the two.

The last of these is achieved most simply (Schoenius, Tyrrell) by inserting θ' after ἂν (*Πάφον θ' ἂν θ'*—Paphos and (the country) which the Nile fertilizes). This, as Professor Dodds points out, leaves Paphos unqualified, in contrast with Cyprus and Pieria. It is characteristic of Euripides to qualify at length places which he names in these escape prayers (*Hipp.* 737-51; cf. *Hec.* 448-74).

The elimination of the Nile involves rather drastic emendation (*Βωκάφου* for *βαρβάρου*, Meursius). But this serves mainly to obscure what is a clear description, and calls for much explanatory comment or further emendation of *ἑκατόστομοι* and *ἄνομβροι*. (See Dodds's edition.)

This leaves us with the elimination of Paphos as the only remaining approach. Most of the emendations here replace *Πάφον* by a neutral word—*γαίαν*, *χθόνα*, *πέδον*. (See Sandys's edition.) In such a case one word is as good as another if *Πάφον* is a gloss which has ousted something from the text; but it is a big 'if'.

Reiske, however, proposed a word of a different kind, *Φάρον*. It is close to being a metathesized form of *Πάφον* and the alteration is a more obvious process than the gloss theory which is, after all, the last resort of resourceful critics. *Φάρον* has received little attention because Reiske gave no reason in support of it.<sup>2</sup> '*Πάφον* emendat Reiskius *Φάρον*,' says Musgrave, 'ni fallor, quia sequentia Papho accommodari posse non credidit.'

I believe *Φάρον* has more to recommend it than any other suggested emendation. In the *Bibliotheca* of 'Apollodorus', Proteus, king of the Egyptians, is represented as the first who received Dionysus (*καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον Πρωτεὺς ἀνὴρ ὑποδέχεται βασιλεὺς Αἰγυπτίων*, iii. 5). 'Apollodorus' speaks of Dionysus as wandering in Egypt and Syria. Euripides implies agreement with this (*Bacchae* 16). In describing the details of the punishment of Lycurgus and

<sup>1</sup> See Dodds's note in his edition of the *Bacchae*, and descriptions of the Nile quoted by him; also Aesch. fr. 290. Musgrave's objection to 'hundred-mouthed' ignores the language of poetry.

<sup>2</sup> '*Πάφον*, f. *Φάρον*, insulam Aegypti apud

Alexandriam; sane in sequentibus Nilum describit. Mire desultorius est Euripides, et vere bacchatur cum Bacchis suis, e Cypro ad Nilum, et statim in Macedoniam transiliens' (Reiske, quoted in Musgrave's edition).

Pentheus it is clear that 'Apollodorus' is handling the same material as the Athenian dramatists used. It seems unlikely that the association of Dionysus with Proteus is a later innovation unknown to Euripides.<sup>1</sup> Already in the Homeric hymn to Dionysus, the god is spoken of in association with Egypt (and Cyprus).<sup>2</sup> Euripides is well acquainted with Proteus, not merely as ruler of Egypt, but as ruler of Egypt who lives on Pharos island. In the *Helen* (4-5) he speaks of 'Proteus, who, when he was alive, was the king of this land, living on the island of Pharos, as lord of Egypt'. For the purpose of his mythical-divine plots Euripides clearly regards Egypt not in a geographical light but in the romantic light of the Homeric poems. He follows the rationalizing Herodotus so far as to reduce Proteus to human stature and deprive him of his more obvious connexions with the sea, but he does not transport him to Memphis, committing rule over the mouth of the Nile to the hitherto unknown Thonis. Proteus still rules from Pharos.

To return to the choral passage in question, if the statement of 'Apollodorus' that Proteus, king of Egypt, received Dionysus, is part of the same tradition which he shares with the dramatists,<sup>3</sup> it would be natural for the chorus to think of Pharos as a land where they had been happy and welcome. We thus have three places acceptable to the bacchanals, each with its appropriate description. The Nile passage accords perfectly with Pharos (viewed with a legendary, and even a geographic, eye). No change other than reading *Φάρων* for *Πάφον* is necessary.

If Pharos was a guess of Reiske's, suggested by the Nile context, it was a guess which was helped by the similarity of sound of the two words. Conversely, at a time when *Φάρος* had ceased to mean anything in a Dionysiac context, a scribe might as readily have guessed the reading *Πάφος* from the Cyprian context, again helped by the likeness between the names.

University College, Dublin

K. O'NOLAN

## AN INSCRIPTION FROM MESAMBRIA

An inscribed stone found at Mesambria and preserved in the museum of Burgas is published as follows in *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae. edidit G. Mihailov* (Sofia, 1956) (no. 344, with pl. 93, below):

“Τὸ πρὶν μὲν πατρὶς τε καὶ οἷς ἑ... οἰσιν α-  
πο[λ]λάκις ἀντιπάλους κτείνας ἐνὶ προμάχοις  
ἐχθόμενοις θεοσσοῖσιν ἐναντὶ ἔδει' Ἀρίστων  
δεῖν δ' ἐν δαίμονις ἐκλαγες ἀνδροφόνους,  
νῦν δ' ὅκ' ὁ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνάντιος ἡλθέ τοι Ἄδης,  
οὐλα[ς], ὡς ἐπέχεις, δάμα χέροντι Ἄδης,

<sup>1</sup> Dionysus is made to seek refuge with Thetis, daughter of Nereus, by 'Apollodorus' iii. 5. Proteus is closely involved with this goddess. He shares the same form-changing powers with her (in Ovid, *Metam.* xi, he—rather treacherously!—advises Peleus, son of Aeacus as to the effective method of coping with the metamorphic Thetis). Aeacus' own sea-wife Psamathe, sister of Thetis, later becomes the wife of Proteus (Eur. *Hel.* 7).

<sup>2</sup> Ἰλιόμας, ἢ Αἰγύπτου ἀφίξεταί ἡ δ' ὁ γε

Κόρινθον ἢ ἐς Ὑπερβορέους ἢ ἐκαστέρω. An earlier or later date for this hymn is hardly significant for this argument.

<sup>3</sup> The broken tradition of the story of Proteus, represented in Greek for us mainly by Homer, Herodotus, Euripides, 'Apollodorus', Diodorus (and Stesichorus), would have been supplemented for a Euripidean audience at least by Aeschylus' satyric drama *Proteus*, and possibly by lost Dionysiac plays.

ἀλλ' ἀρίστα κῦδανε τὸν ἀντιπάλων ὀλετῆρα  
 ἀνέρα καὶ στεφάνους δᾶμος ἔρεψε νέκυν  
 ἄλκα δ' ἐν ζωοῖς τε συνάρχοντες τῖον ἰσθλοί,  
 τάλικα καὶ φθιμένῳ τίμιά τοι τέλεσαν.

Saeculo I<sup>a</sup>. I. In lapide AIN i.e. post a littera prima est γ vel ρ, littera secunda λ vel χ."

In *Listy Filologické*, v (bxxx) (1957), p. 293, L. Vidman improves line 6 to

οὐλα[?], ὅς ἐπέχεις, δῶμ' Ἀχερουσιάδος.

The poem may perhaps have been as follows:

Τὸ πρῖν μὲν πάτραι τε καὶ οἷς [ἐτέρ]οισιν ἀ[ρ]ήγων?  
 πολλάκις ἀντιπάλους κτεῖνας ἐνὶ προμάχοις,  
 ἐχθομένοις Βεασοῖσιν ἐναντίε, δαί' Ἀρίστων,  
 δευὰ δ' ἐν ὑσμίναις ἐκλαγες ἀνδροφόνους.  
 νῦν δ', ὅκ' ὁ δυσνίκαιος ἐναντίος ἦλθέ τοι Αἴδας,  
 Οὐδαίας ἐπέχεις δῶμ' Ἀχερουσιάδος·  
 ἀλλ' Ἀρετὰ κῦδανε τὸν ἀντιπάλων ὀλετῆρα  
 ἀνέρα, καὶ στεφάνους δᾶμος ἔρεψε νέκυν,  
 ἄλκα δ' ἐν ζωοῖς τε συνάρχοντες τῖον ἰσθλοί,  
 τάλικα καὶ φθιμένῳ τίμιά τοι τέλεσαν.

Line 1. The supplement is proposed with great diffidence. The last word in the line can hardly be anything but a present participle, and since the first letter is alpha and the second either rho or chi, ἀρήγων suggests itself; but according to Mihailov the third letter is either lambda or chi. The remains of the fourth letter might be part of a gamma, and from the photograph it would seem that the third might be alpha as well as lambda or chi. So ἀράγων? But the η of ἀρήγων is panhellenic, and is not α in Doric, as is shown by the name of the Corinthian painter Ἀρήγων (Strabo 8. 343) and of the Amazon Ἀρηξιμάχα on a Corinthian vase (Payne, *N.C.*, p. 161, no. 2; Bothmer, *Amazons*, p. 3). If ἀράγων was written, the poet may have hyper-dorized, but one does not readily accuse him of that.

As for the noun preceding the verb, part of the first letter is preserved and according to Mihailov the letter might be a kappa. If it is, [κλάρ]οισιν is the only word that occurs to me and it does not please. What one sees in the photograph is simply an upright, and if there are no further traces on the stone, epsilon would be possible: so [ἐτέρ]οισιν.

Line 6. The third letter on the stone does seem to be lambda not delta, but lambda does not make sense. An error of the stone-cutter? In Lycophron (*Alexandra* 48 and 694) οὐδαία is used as an epithet of Persephone, and glossed in the paraphrase as καταχθονία; in our poem it would be equivalent to Περσεφόνα. The poet perceived that, after ἀνδροφόνους, Περσεφόνους would be inelegant, and substituted a more recondite word.

Line 7. Hardly anything of the fifth, sixth, seventh letters is preserved. Simonides (99 Bergk, 121 Diehl):

οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες, ἐπεὶ σφ' Ἀρετὴ καθύπερθε  
 κυδαίνουσ' ἀνέγει δώματος ἐξ Αἴδεα.

HORACE, *ODES* i. 32. 15-16

o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi  
grata testudo Iovis, o laborum  
dulce lenimen, mihi cumque salve  
rite vocanti.

PROFESSOR EDUARD FRAENKEL has recently demonstrated<sup>1</sup> in detail the close approximation of the form and language of this poem to that of prayers. He has shown that the closing formula *mihi . . . salve . . .* has many parallels in Greek of the form *χαῖρέ μοι* (in Latin he compares Virg. *Aen.* xi. 97 f.). *cumque* he defends as belonging to obsolete ritual language. He allows that interpreters who take it as equivalent to *quandocumque* (which is also the explanation of Porphyrio) may be right, but thinks it more likely that Horace intended the sense to be *utcumque rite te voco*. The difficulty created by the lack of any parallel for *cumque* (taken in whichever sense) he recognizes, but says (p. 171): 'Everything drives us to the conclusion that in this clause Horace's starting-point was not a living usage but rather a fossilized formula found in some antiquated relics of hieratic language. In digging it up and introducing it into this solemn prayer he allowed himself the kind of artificiality and indeed linguistic violence which it is difficult to avoid in attempting to revive a phrase that has long been obsolete.'

But the interpretation of *cumque* as equivalent to *quandocumque* seems, in fact, to be ruled out by a closer examination of the context. It is hard to define the precise nuance of meaning to be attached to *mihi salve* as distinct from *salve*, or to *χαῖρέ μοι* as distinct from *χαῖρε*; but perhaps it might be expressed by translating it as something like 'accept my salutation' as against 'hail'. The point to be noted is that it does not make a special request of the deity for precise action (not even that he should be favourable)—a request, that is, for some action to be taken which the worshipper could request now to be done on this and also on future occasions. Yet, if *cumque* is equivalent to *quandocumque*, it clearly implies that a general request is being made for a certain action to be performed on specific future occasions. But this is not possible in view of the meaning of *mihi salve*.<sup>2</sup>

Fraenkel has made it certain by his analysis of the poem that the relevant parallels to the passage are *quocumque nomine* and similar formulae of prayers. Consequently, he points out, *cumque* must have the meaning of *utcumque*. Now, while it seems possible that *cumque* might have the meaning of *quandocumque*, since the *-cumque* element in these compounds contains the temporal particle *cum*,<sup>3</sup> it seems very unlikely that *cumque* could at any time have been used alone in a modal sense. Its modal force is absolutely contingent on the addition of the modal particle *ut*.

The passage has been endlessly emended, and it seems ridiculous to add to these emendations. But they have all ignored the ritual element in the words, which Fraenkel has decisively brought out; and they have failed to explain

<sup>1</sup> *Horace* (Oxford) 1937, pp. 168 ff. My debt to this analysis of the poem is fundamental.

<sup>2</sup> This argument disposes of the possibility that any temporal particle or adverb, with a future reference, stood here.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, Stolz-Leumann 5, p. 288; Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. Étymol. de la Langue Latine*, 3rd ed. 1950-1, s.v. *quicumque* and *quom*; Walde-Hofmann, s.v. *quicumque*, *quom*, and esp. *cumque*.



how *cumque* came to stand here *by the time of Porphyrio*, in a text so subject to exegesis. Further, corruption, if corruption there is, is absolutely confined to the word *cumque*.<sup>1</sup> I would suggest, therefore, that Horace may have written *mihi quoque salve / rite vocanti*: 'in whatever style I call upon you (or, as I call upon you by each and every style), accept my salutation.' That is, *quoque rite* means almost *quocumque ritu* (or, *omni ritu*).

Fraenkel has shown that Horace is using archaic language and form, and the archaic background of the phrase attributed to him by this emendation must first be elucidated. In early Latin, *quisque* is used in a sense close to that of *quisquis* and *quicumque*,<sup>2</sup> and in circumstances which make it clear that the usage belonged to the language of legal institutions and prayer. Several times Plautus employs the usage in parodies of the praetor's edict: for instance, *Capit.* 797-8:

tum genu ad quemque iecero ad terram dabo,  
dentilegos omnis mortalis faciam, quemque offendero;

the nature of the passage is clearly indicated by *edico* (803), *basilicas edictiones atque imperiosas* (811) and *edictiones aedilicias* (823); or *Mil.* 156 ff.:

ni hercle diffregeritis talos posthac quemque in tegulis . . .  
quemque a milite hoc videritis hominem in nostris tegulis,  
extra unum Palaestronem, huc deturbatote in viam;

here, again, the whole tone, *edico* (159), and the future imperatives make clear the parody of the praetorian edict. So also in *Merc.* 20, the legal tone and *multat* (21) indicate the origin: cf. also the solemn pronouncements in *Asin.* 404 and *Mil.* 460. In Terence *Hec.* 385 ff. we read:

sed quom orata huius reminiscor nequeo quin lacrumem miser.  
'quaeque fors fortunast' inquit 'nobis quae te hodie obtulit,  
per eam te obsecramus ambae, si ius si fas est, uti  
advorsa eius per te tecta tacitaque apud omnis sient. . .'

Here the whole context makes clear the tone of solemn tragic language, and on *quaeque fors fortuna* (386) Donatus notes 'precatio'. Livy i. 24. 3 is to be added to these passages: *priusquam dimicarent, foedus ictum inter Romanos et Albanos est his legibus, ut, cuiusque populi cives eo certamine vicissent, is alteri populo cum bona pace imperitaret*,<sup>3</sup> where the stilted, precise language indicates that Livy is closely paraphrasing the original decree, or at least pretending to do so.

It is thus clear that *quisque*, used in an indefinite sense, is archaic and characteristic of legal and religious formulae.<sup>4</sup> The case is more difficult to illustrate for *rite*. The adverb *rite* is, in origin, the ablative of \**ris* or \**ritis*,<sup>5</sup> an

<sup>1</sup> This is made certain, not only by Fraenkel's parallels for the dative in Greek prayers, or by the parallels at *Aen.* xi. 97 and Plaut. *Stich.* 585 (see below), but by the fact that *mihi* is essential to the sense—the only reference to the worshipper has been the first person plurals in the first stanza.

<sup>2</sup> This was baldly stated by ancient grammarians: Priscian iii. p. 138, 15 Keil: 'invenitur *quisque* pro *quicumque*, *qualisque* pro *quacumque*, *similiter adverbialiter quoque* pro *quocumque*, *quaque* pro *quacumque*, *quandoque* pro *quandocumque*.' P. Ferrarino, 'Cumque e i composti di que' (*Memorie della R. Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, Classe di Scienze Morali, serie iv, volume iv, 1941-2*),

pp. 144 ff., has drawn a carefully observed distinction between *quisque* and *quisquis* in these phrases, which might be roughly expressed by saying that *quisque* implies 'each and every', *quisquis* 'any at all'. (It is unfortunate that Ferrarino ignored the epigraphic evidence as well as the important passage of Terence mentioned below.)

<sup>3</sup> For the stylistic level of *imperitare*, see Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 191 n. 5.

<sup>4</sup> For its occurrence in inscriptions, see Dessau, *I.L.S.* iii. 2, index p. 860 s.v. For its occasional occurrence in later Latin, see Wölfflin, *A.L.L.* vii. 476.

<sup>5</sup> See Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 560, and Kühner-Holzweissig, p. 1017.



alternative form to *ritus*,<sup>1</sup> which became obsolete as a noun but was revived by Statius (*Theb.* xi. 285 *rite nefasto*). No dictionary or grammatical handbook notes *rite* used as a noun elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> but it seems a certain inference that the traditionalist Statius must have had authority which satisfied him that he might legitimately use it in a religious context.<sup>3</sup> Horace may, therefore, have used the obsolete and archaic word here deliberately, in a context which is intended to recall the ancient language of prayer.

If so, he has written *quoque rite* as an archaism, recalling for his immediate purpose a ritual phrase (for which *quoquo ritu* of the prayer in Apul. *Met.* xi. 2. 3. may be compared), which had a significance close to that of the series of *quocumque nomine* formulae.<sup>4</sup> Horace is then saying, in effect, what Catullus says to Diana (34. 21 f.) *sis quocumque tibi placet / sancta nomine*. The escape-clause *quocumque nomine* is used after the deity has already been addressed by a title or titles, as Horace has already said *barbite . . . o decus . . . o laborum . . .* But it should be noted that where phrases like *quocumque nomine* are used, then some such verbal phrase as *tibi placet* or *fas est* is added: cf. e.g. Cat. 34. 21 f., Apul. *Met.* xi. 2. 3 *quoquo nomine quoquo ritu quaqua facie te fas est invocare*, Macrob. iii. 9. 10 *sive quo alio nomine fas est nominare*. Such is the archaic and technical background of the phrase: but Horace does not say this—he says ‘By whatever style I call upon you (or, as I call upon you by each and every style)’.

The syntax of the lines needs attention. If the address was to correspond exactly to the usual form in prayers, Horace should have said something like ‘*sive quo alio ritu te vocare fas est, salve*’. Instead of this he has written the participial phrase *mihi . . . vocanti*. Though examples are very infrequent, there clearly existed in Latin the possibility of using a dative with *salvere* as in Greek χαίρει μοι; for instance, Virg. *Aen.* xi. 97 *salve aeternum mihi, maxime Palla*, and Kiessling-Heinze<sup>7</sup> quote Plaut. *Stich.* 585 *salvo salvo, Gelasime* (in a passage of mock-solemn address). Horace has made use of this possibility, making the pronoun emphatic and attaching to it a participial clause. This clause is intended to bear the burden of the escape-clause usual in prayers. But, in doing this, he has sacrificed (in the interest of brevity and neatness) some of the usual content of such a clause. The substitution of a participial clause for the usual *sive*-clause has meant that instead of saying to the god: ‘I call you this and this and this, or whatever other name is right (or, is pleasing to you)’—thus assuring the deity that any form of address that pleases him is in the worshipper’s mind—Horace has said ‘I call you this and this . . . however

<sup>1</sup> For the doublet *rite*—*ritu*, cf. *nocte*—*noctu* and *die*—*diu*. *noctu* was still being used as a noun by Ennius, Plautus, and Cato.

<sup>2</sup> It seems to the present writer that there is, in fact, another instance in *Carm. Epigr.* 1966. 9 *rite quod aeterno migrarim dedita Christo*. Most editors take *aeterno* with *Christo*, but Lundström (*Erans*, xiv, 167) points out that the epithet is not used with *Christus* and is here quite otiose. He takes *aeterno* as a dative of motion; but the awkwardness and artificiality of this is unlikely in so competent an epitaph. It is better to take *aeterno* with *rite*: the quality of a Christian’s religious devotion is often described on the epitaphs. Here the woman’s devotion is eternal *aeterno*

*rite dedita Christo*, and this is the important fact on which all else depends: ‘my husband knows that I have gone hence in eternal devotion to Christ and that in the better (heavenly) life I wear a well-deserved crown’ (rather than ‘my husband knows that I have gone to eternity duly devoted to Christ’).

<sup>3</sup> It is noteworthy that most of the archaisms in Statius discussed by Klotz (*A.L.L.* xv. 401 ff.) occur also in Horace, and that Statius clearly owed them not to study of archaic texts, but to Ciceronian and post-Ciceronian authors (see Kroll, *Studien z. Verständnis der röm. Lit.*, p. 255 n. 16).

<sup>4</sup> See Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 144 ff.

I style you, accept my salutation'. He precluded himself from using the hackneyed formula ('whatever I ought to call you') by the participial form which he chose to substitute for the usual phrase. The words *mihi quoque rite vocanti* are equivalent to an apology for uncertainty as to the correct title of address: it is close to the similar mock-apology which Horace addresses to the *pia testa*: iii. 21. 5 f. *quocumque lectum nomine Massicum / servas*. In both cases Horace avoids repetition of the hackneyed formula, and adds piquancy by his variation. In i. 32. 15 f. Horace has introduced with suitable adaptation, if my suggestion is right, a phrase from ancient prayers (where it may, for instance, have been a member of a series of similar phrases in an escape-clause: e.g. *quaque te facie quoque rite quoque nomine vocare fas est*).<sup>1</sup>

It would be unparalleled for Horace, or any Augustan poet, to introduce a verbatim quotation into his poetry.<sup>2</sup> The general ancient practice was to alter in some way the material so used:<sup>3</sup> Virgil, for instance, does not, despite appearances, reproduce Ennius unchanged—besides the slight verbal changes, he sometimes uses the exact words but alters their application.<sup>4</sup> Horace proceeds in the same way: this can be seen quite clearly, for instance, in the *Carmen Saeculare*, for an inscription is extant recording in archaic ritual language the various sacrifices and rites to which Horace alludes. He recalls, without repeating exactly, this archaic language: 5 *Sibyllini . . . versus (libri)*; 6 *virgines lectas puerosque castos (patrimi et matrimi)*; 49 *bobus . . . albis (bove mare pulchro, bove femina pulchra)*; 49 *veneratur (precatur)*; 66 f. *remque Romanam Latiumque felix . . . meliusque semper prorogat aevum (quodque melius siet p. R. Quiritium)*. When trying to recall the old *carmina*, he was faced with the further necessity of avoiding the explicit and prosaic *horror archaicus*. He has done this here by substituting a participial clause for the old relative clause; this has involved a further syntactical change. The form *rite* is an obvious archaism and Horace may have intended *quoque* also to be recognized as an archaism even without the finite verb which would be normal in its archaic context:<sup>5</sup> he will then have wished it to be understood as indefinite ('whatever . . .'). But the indefinite character of *quoque* is obscured when it is deprived of its finite verb, and it may be that Horace would have intended it, and that it would have been taken by his readers, as a bold extension of the use of *quisque* in certain phrases like *cuiusque modi, cuiusque generis, in quoque genere, quoque tempore*<sup>6</sup> etc. where it almost means *omnis* and might be translated 'each and every'.<sup>7</sup> In that case, *quoque rite vocanti* will have been nearer to 'calling upon you by each and every style' than to 'calling upon you by whatever style'.<sup>8</sup> But whatever the precise

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Apul. *Met.* xi. 2. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Direct quotations, such as that from the old nursery-rhyme in *Epist.* i. 1. 59, which are signalled as quotations, are not relevant here.

<sup>3</sup> See the excellent discussion of the practice of Greek authors by Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, pp. 241-75.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, the nice adaptation of Ennius' *volito virum per ora virum* in *Georg.* iii. 9 *victorque virum volitare per ora*; or *Georg.* iii. 76 from storks to colts or *Aen.* iv. 404 from elephants to ants. But it happens with the humbler borrowings as well.

<sup>5</sup> The construction of *quicumque* with

ellipsis of a finite verb becomes frequent from the time of Cicero.

<sup>6</sup> See in general Madvig, *de Fin.*, Excursus vi, and Schmalz-Hofmann<sup>2</sup>, p. 486; and in particular Caesar, *B.G.* v. 12. 2; Sallust, *Cat.* 28. 4; 40. 6; Cicero, *Att.* v. 9. 2; v. 10. 5; *de Div.* ii. 24.

<sup>7</sup> Note the way in which *quisque* is used by Horace himself: *Sat.* ii. 8. 77 *in lecto quoque videres stridere . . . susurros*; *Epist.* i. 18. 68 *quid de quoque viro . . .*; *Sat.* i. 4. 106 *vitiorum quoque notando* (cf. ii. 3. 2 *scriptorum quaeque reterens*).

<sup>8</sup> i.e. referring primarily to the way in which Horace has already addressed the

syntactical value of *quoque*,<sup>1</sup> the phrase is not just a 'quotation' from an old prayer: Horace, while retaining the archaic flavour, has adapted the formula syntactically to the highly artificial style of his poem.<sup>2</sup> Thus it may be said that *quoque rite vocanti* is intended to recall phrases of the pattern *quoque rite te vocare fas est*, in such a way that *rite* is an immediate and direct borrowing but that *quoque* has undergone some alteration of syntactical value to fit its new, highly polished context.

Objection to this interpretation cannot be made on the ground that *rite vocare* is a fixed phrase, for the reader is prepared for what is coming by the anticipation of *quoque* and the phrase will have had its own analogy in technical language. If *quoque* stood in the text here it would have been very apt to be taken by a learned expositor, who thought he was clear on the meaning of the rest of the clause (and especially *rite*), as either an abbreviation of, or simply a miswriting of, *quomque* (see Quint. i. 5. 7), which would lend itself readily to learned interpretation. This would then have been taken as the obviously better reading in an age when a conjunction *cumque* actually existed,<sup>3</sup> and when the existence of an ablative case *rite* had been totally forgotten.

To sum up: Horace thought that archaisms had a place in living poetry and says (*Epist.* ii. 2. 115 ff.) *obscurata diu populo bonus eruet atque / proferet in lucem speciosa vocabula rerum, / quae priscis memorata Catonibus atque Cethegis / nunc situs informis premit et deserta vetustas* (cf. also *A.P.* 70). He followed his own advice in the *Odes* with such words as *Diespiter*, *sub divo*, *adorea*, *duellum*, *spargier* and many others. Most relevant for mention here is the fact that he seems to have been the first poet to introduce the archaic *quandoque* (which stands in the same relationship to *quandocumque* as *quisque* to *quicumque*) into elevated poetry.<sup>4</sup> Now, whatever was replaced by *cumque* must have been something, in this popular and much-commentated text, that was even less understandable to the late Latin age than *cumque*. The likeliest sort of word is an archaism, or a bold adaptation of an archaism, especially if it stood in agreement with another word in the text which was itself open to misunderstanding because it was a commonly used word, and yet, in the way Horace wanted it understood, was an even remoter archaism (i.e. *rite*). I suggest, therefore, that Horace may have written *quoque . . . rite vocanti* as a phrase recalling the archaic language of prayers, feeling it suitable as a conclusion to this poem which, as we have learnt from Fraenkel, is itself a prayer on a traditional pattern. If he *did* write this, he may justly be censured for obscurity, and the phrase may be regarded as an experiment that failed and received its due reward at the hands of scribes and grammarians.

Balliol College, Oxford

GORDON WILLIAMS

lyre, exhausting the possibilities by addressing it in its relationship to the gods and then to the poet on earth, enumerating each point singly and distinctly.

<sup>1</sup> There are other uncertainties of this sort in the highly poetical and artificial language which Horace was compelled to invent for his *Odes*: for example, it is not possible to say what is the precise meaning and syntactical value of *neglegens* in iii. 8. 25; it is obviously a bold adaptation, but not to be emended on that account.

<sup>2</sup> In somewhat the same way, he has

combined the archaising thesis with a modern independent construction of *quandocumque* in *Sat.* i. 9. 33 *garrulus hunc quando consumet cumque*.

<sup>3</sup> On *cumque* used for *cum* in late Latin, see Weyman, *A.L.L.* xv. 578; *Glotta*, iii (1912), 193.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g. *Odes* iv. 1. 17; 2. 34. See Schmalz-Hofmann<sup>2</sup>, p. 741, and Ferrarino, *op. cit.*, pp. 102 ff. This experiment recommended itself to later poets; but *quoque rite* presumably did not, with the possible exception of Statius.

PLINY, *N.H.* ii. 22

MR. G. E. M. DE STE CROIX<sup>1</sup> has recently examined all the available evidence for Graeco-Roman methods of accounting and has succeeded in showing, to the discomfiture of those who have previously written on the subject, that the Greeks and Romans never adopted a double-entry system, not even a simple bilateral system recording receipts on one side of an account and payments on the other; he can find only one instance of an account drawn up in a bilateral form, P. Goodsp. Cair. 30, a papyrus from Caranis in the Roman period, and this has 'receipts and payments not on opposite "pages" (the successive columns of the papyrus roll do not naturally fall into pairs) but separately aligned vertically side by side within each column of writing'. He gives examples also of accounts in which tabulation is by columns, but of these none is in bilateral form, nor is the one writing-tablet containing accounts which he has found (*C.I.L.* iii. 2, p. 953, no. xv), although it displays an 'attempt at tabulation in a single column'. When we consider the plethora of papyrus-accounts which has survived, the argument *ex silentio*, or rather *ex absentia*, seems to be permissible.

There is, however, one passage in classical literature which has always been understood to refer to the use of a bilateral system of accounting: Pliny, *N.H.* ii. 22. In this 'purple passage' Pliny criticizes from a Stoic point of view the extravagances of the devotees of Fortune, i.e. Chance, who have made out of her a *medium numen* with sovereign power over human destiny. The relevant sentence reads, in the Teubner edition of K. Mayhoff (Leipzig, 1892-1909), a revision of the earlier Teubner edition of L. Jan (1854-75).

Huic omnia expensa, huic feruntur accepta, et in tota ratione mortalium sola utramque paginam facit.

feruntur Faop referuntur dT omnia feruntur Eo

The variant of d and T may be disregarded as an attempt to rectify what their scribes thought to be a solecism, viz. the apparent zeugma involved in the use of *ferre* ἀπό κοινού with *accepta* as well as with *expensa*.<sup>2</sup> Between E and F there is normally little to choose *ceteris paribus*, but here the support of a, which is probably of the same family as E, of o, the *excerpta Roberti Crickladensis*, which frequently preserve a sound reading, and of p, which Mayhoff held, though often corrupt, to represent an earlier tradition, tips the scales heavily in favour of F, especially as the deliberate insertion of *omnia* for stylistic reasons is at least as easy to explain as its inadvertent omission. Jan's edition, however, preferred the *omnia feruntur* of E, as did also those of Gelenius (1549) and Detlefsen (1866), but the Budé editor, J. Beaujeu, who has re-examined E, Parisinus 6795, finds that it too in fact omits *omnia*, which thus survives only as the reading of the older editions. The Teubner text of Mayhoff may, therefore, be regarded as being as sound as any text of Pliny's second book, especially cc. 1-196, is likely to be. But it is interesting to note that a reading which found favour with at least three of the best-known editors of the *Natural History* was *Huic omnia*

<sup>1</sup> 'Greek and Roman Accounting' in *Studies in the History of Accounting*, ed. A. C. Littleton and B. S. Yamey (Sweet and Maxwell, London, 1956), pp. 14-74. I am grateful to the author for allowing me to develop an idea which was originally his and

for reading and criticizing my draft of this note.

<sup>2</sup> For examples of the use of *acceptum* (or *accepto*) *referre* (or *ferre*), *expensum* (or *expenso*) *ferre*, and one of *nomen* *referre* in the sense of *expensum ferre*, *ibid.* p. 46, nn. 13-16.



*feruntur accepta*. . . This was adopted without comment by Franz (Leipzig, 1778-91) and Sillig (Hamburg and Gotha, 1851-8), being, apparently, derived from the second edition of Hardouin (Paris, 1723). The error, which was first noticed in G. Brotier's edition of 1779, recurs in Hardouin's third edition (Paris, 1741), but it is not in his first Delphin edition of 1685. It has no manuscript support and is such an obvious example of lipography—probably omitting *expensa*, *huc omnia*, since Hardouin<sup>1</sup> read *omnia* twice—that we must dismiss it, though not without regret, for, if it were justifiable, it would dispose at one blow of the chief reason for the undoubted misunderstanding which has bedevilled all previous interpretations of the sentence, the antithesis between *expensa* and *accepta*.

This division of items into *expensa* and *accepta* has led editors and translators to assume that *utramque*, which must, granted, mean 'both', implies a definite reference to the late medieval and modern practice of placing receipts and expenditure on opposite sides of the account, the so-called bilateral system. Hardouin, for example, could write, in a note on the sentence, "Translatio ducta est a mercatorum libris, seu codicillis rationalibus, quos ita complicabant, ut ad singulas apertiones duae paginae viderentur: quarum in altera accepta lucraque, expensa in altera damnaque paterent."<sup>2</sup> This quite unjustifiable assumption has been repeated *ad nauseam* by later editors and by lexicographers, even when they have wrongly adopted the text of Hardouin<sup>2</sup>, as have Facciolati-Forcellini-Furlanetto in their *Lexicon*, s.v. *pagina*, and the phrase *paginam utramque facere* has been cited as proverbial for the filling of both sides, debit and credit, of an account by, for example, Smith and L. and S.; the latter have been further misled into translating *acceptum* as 'the receipt, and in account-books the credit side' and in *acceptum referre* as 'to carry over to the credit side'. Now that Mr. de Ste Croix has removed the grounds for such an anachronistic conception of Graeco-Roman accounting, we are at last in a position to repudiate the interpretation wrongly based on it and to re-examine the sentence in order to discover Pliny's meaning.

The sentence itself is not as easy to translate and explain as may at first sight appear. The first clause is clear enough: 'To her name are set down all payments and receipts', i.e. as men make up their reckoning of the bad and good things of life, they write them all down, whether bad or good, as received at the hands of Dame Fortune. In the second clause, however, at least three difficulties present themselves, apart from that of its logical relation to the first.

- (i) In writing in *tota ratione mortalium* Pliny visualized an account-book similar to those which he, as a landowner, would have been in the habit of compiling, or having compiled, for personal, domestic, or agricultural finances; this account-book would record the fortunes of all mortals or, perhaps, all mortal affairs, for it is not out of the question to take *mortalium* as neuter if we bear in mind that Pliny, like other Silver Age writers, not infrequently used as nouns even the oblique cases of the neuter plural of adjectives.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> L. Ulrichs, *Chrestomathia Pliniana* (Berlin, 1857), was apparently thinking of recto and verso of a sheet of papyrus when he wrote, ad loc.: 'In den Rechnungsbüchern der Römer stand die Ausgabe auf der Vordern-, die Einnahme auf der Rückseite verzeichnet',

a practice of which there is no evidence at all.

<sup>2</sup> D. J. Campbell, *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae Liber Secundus* (Aberdeen, 1936), p. 17, cites five examples of this usage from Book II, not including *mortalium* as a possibility.



- (ii) *Pagina* is the equivalent of *σελίς* and thus normally admits of two possible translations, either 'page' or 'column', *charta seu pars chartae*, as Facciolati-Forcellini-Furlanetto neatly put it. Choice between these two possibilities in a particular instance would depend upon the kind of material used, waxed tablet or papyrus roll; in Pliny's time the material usually employed for ephemeral accounts, except, of course, in Egypt, where papyrus was cheap and plentiful, was the waxed tablet, and so it is probable that the reference here is to the waxed tablet. It could, as Mr. de Ste Croix points out, contain up to ten leaves, but *utramque* in this passage makes it clear that it is a two-leaved tablet which is meant.
- (iii) *Facere* in the present context should mean 'to compose, compile', as it does when used with *tabulas* and *rationes* (see *Thesaurus*, s.v. *facio*, I. 2 a). The rendering 'fills' (Smith, L. and S., Loeb) and the Budé 'remplit' introduce a possible ambiguity, as do 'fills up' and 'makes up', which also suggest themselves. 'Makes up' calls to mind the sense borne by *facere* in Cat. 5. 10 and Juv. 14. 326—'make a total', but the connexion, though interesting, ought not to be pressed too closely, for the object of the verb here is essentially different: *paginam* is actual and concrete, whereas *milìa multa* in Catullus and *tertia quadrìngenta* in Juvenal are themselves totals.<sup>1</sup>

The second clause, then, may safely be translated: 'and she by herself compiles both pages in the whole account-book of mortals (or of mortal affairs)'.

The relation between the two cola is thus seen to be very loose: in the first men are pictured as making up the account themselves and setting down the various items of profit and loss to Fortune's name, but in the second Fortune herself becomes the accountant and compiles both pages. Such a confusion of thought and metaphor is not unexpected in the elder Pliny; its detection here strengthens our case for resisting an attempt to establish a close connexion between *utramque* in the second clause and *expensa*, *accepta* in the first. The use of *utramque* would be natural to one who, like Pliny, was accustomed to set down or examine accounts on a two-leaved tablet. In other words, the second clause is a circumlocution of the kind which its writer loved: it means no more than *et totam rationem mortalium sola facit*. What Pliny wished to say was that all the entries made are exclusively attributed to Fortune, but, in saying this, he recalled to mind—if he had not, as he almost certainly had, an actual example before him at the time—the picture of the familiar two-leaved tablet, and his weakness for rhetorical effect did the rest: having already worked *sola* and *una* to death in the previous sentence, he could not resist the temptation to repeat *sola* yet again in this and to emphasize it still further by an antithesis with *utramque*. Ignorance of ancient methods of accounting has misled editors and others into relating this *utramque* too closely to the *expensa* and *accepta* which have gone before, and those who have to translate Latin metaphors borrowed from accounting should beware of perpetuating the error.

University College, Cardiff

B. R. REES

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nep. *Epam.* 3. 6 *eam summam cum fecerat*.

## MAM. SCAURUS CITES PRECEDENT

IN A.D. 22 C. Junius Silanus was accused of extortion in Asia and—to discourage possible advocates, Tacitus tells us—of *maiestas*.<sup>1</sup> By far the most important of the accusers was Mam. Aemilius Scaurus, who had probably been consul in the previous year.<sup>2</sup> It was a most unpopular thing ('infamis opera') for a senior statesman to do: even in Cicero's day, long before the emergence of the *delator* as the *bête noire* of the aristocracy, the prosecution of senators had, on the whole, brought discredit upon the prosecutor, unless he was a younger man furthering his own career.<sup>3</sup> Naturally enough, Scaurus had to find good precedents. He cited three: 'L. Cottam a Scipione Africano, Servium Galbam a Catone censorio, P. Rutilium a M. Scauro accusatos.' Tacitus bitterly remarks that those great men were not involved in *that* kind of case (referring, no doubt, to the added *maiestas* charge); but how good were the precedents in all other respects?

The first two were well-known *repetundae* cases. That of Galba—one of Cato's most celebrated cases—belongs to 149 B.C. and offers no difficulty. (See *O.R.F.*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 79 f.) Cotta is slightly more puzzling. Cicero calls him *ueterator*, and his life was a disgraceful example of prodigality and insolvency. He was prosecuted *repetundarum* by Scipio Aemilianus in 138 B.C. and acquitted (it seems) through jealousy of his prosecutor's power.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately we are not told the scene of his depredations. The prosecution comes too late to be referred to events that had taken place in his praetorship and must refer to those of his consulship in 144 (and subsequent proconsulship, if any). In that year Scipio had already shown his hostility to Cotta by preventing his going to Spain; but it is clear from his *bon mot* on that occasion that Cotta, unlike his colleague Galba, had at that time not yet had a *repetundae* case in his reprehensible past.<sup>5</sup> In 142 (-141) B.C. Scipio was censor, and we know that he took his task very seriously. In 140 he had to defend himself against a charge brought by a disgruntled tribune, Ti. Claudius Asellus; and straight after this—as far as we can tell—he was sent to the East as the head of a Senatorial commission with an extensive itinerary. It is not surprising, therefore, that it was only in 138 that his case against Cotta came to trial.<sup>6</sup> If, however, the charge did refer to his consulship, it is difficult to find a province to which he may have been sent. We have seen that it was not Spain; and Spain, as far as we know, was at this time the only part of the Empire that needed a consular governor for major warfare. Consuls, at this time, were not normally sent to perfectly peaceful provinces. And if Cotta had had a war to fight, whether in Macedonia (where there was intermittent

<sup>1</sup> Tac. *Ann.* iii. 66. I should like to thank my friend Mr. R. Sealey for pointing out to me that the passage needs explaining and for discussing my explanation with me.

<sup>2</sup> *P.I.R.*<sup>2</sup> i. 68 f.; Degraasi, *Fasti cons.* 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cic. *Off.* ii. 49; cf. *Div. in Caec.* i and 66 f.; Quint. xi. 1. 57.

<sup>4</sup> Sources in *O.R.F.*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 129 f. Livy, *per. Oxyrh.* iv gives the date; oddly enough, Cicero did not know it—any more than the Loeb editor of Tacitus (*ad loc.*). That the case was *repetundarum* is clear from *Div. in Caec.* 69. App. *B.C.* i. 22 may refer to this

Cotta or (thus Cichorius, *R.St.* 78) to his son, later *cos.* 119. On the elder Cotta and his circle see also *Historia* 1957, 318 f.

<sup>5</sup> Val. Max. vi. 4. 2: 'neutrum, inquit, mihi mitti placet, quia alter nihil habet, alteri nihil est satis.' The latter must be Galba, who had been accused *repetundarum* (see above) and was known to be guilty; the former is Cotta, who, as tribune of the plebs, had tried to use his sacrosanctity to avoid paying his debts (Val. Max. vi. 5. 4).

<sup>6</sup> On Scipio's duties in the years 142-140 B.C., see Broughton, *M.R.R.* i. 474 f.

fighting under attested praetorian governors) or even just beyond the borders of Italy against Gauls or Illyrians, we should expect a mention of it in the *Periocha* of Livy and the Livian tradition, which meticulously records even minor skirmishes. In fact, we have no reason to think that Cotta did any fighting at all in his consulship. He may have found odd jobs to do in Gaul, just beyond the borders of Italy. But we may well suppose—in the absence of any record of an alternative possibility—that, when both the consuls of 144 B.C. contended for Spain, that was because there was no other province (in the later sense) for them; and that, when neither of them actually got Spain, neither of them got any province at all. In that case the usual practice was to assign the consuls 'Italia' as their *provincia*. It will be recalled that an attempt was made to do something of the sort to Caesar in 59 B.C.<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to find another instance of a prosecution *repetundarum* for offences committed against *socii* in Italy; but there is, of course, no reason why a charge should not lie on those grounds; and in view of Scipio's known interest in the Italian *socii* (and especially their upper classes), whom he was to defend so effectively in 129 B.C.,<sup>2</sup> it is not at all surprising that he should have brought such a case against an *inimicus*. Though Gaul cannot be excluded, *Italia* is historically an attractive suggestion.

It is, however, the last of Scaurus' precedents that is the most difficult and the most interesting; and it has been unaccountably neglected. M. Scaurus, later *Princeps Senatus*, prosecuted P. Rutilius Rufus for *ambitus* in 116 B.C., after defeating him in the consular elections for the following year and securing acquittal on a similar charge brought by Rutilius against himself. All that we know about the case, apart from these 'background' facts, is a single joke by one of Rutilius' counsel (Cic. *Br.* 113; *De Or.* ii. 280). In view of Rutilius' later career it may be regarded as certain that he was acquitted.

Is this the case to which Mam. Scaurus is referring? Commentators seem to have universally assumed that it is. Yet how is this case relevant as a precedent for Scaurus? The other two cases have certain features in common, all of them very much to the point that he was making in order to justify his prosecution of Silanus: (a) they are both *repetundarum*; (b) consequently they are both attempts to defend *socii populi Romani* against oppression; (c) they are both made by senior statesmen at the height of their authority and power; (d) finally, they are both *causes célèbres*, reported as such—even in our scrappy tradition on the worst-documented period of the later Republic—by a multiplicity of sources. Let us now compare M. Scaurus' prosecution of Rutilius under these heads: (a) it was *ambitus* and therefore not a proper precedent; (b) it was undertaken as an act of private vengeance for a similar action by Rutilius; (c) the prosecutor, at the time consul designate, was as yet far from being a senior statesman, particularly as he was practically a *novus homo*;<sup>3</sup> he was not nearly as high in rank as his noble and consular descendant in A.D. 22; (d) finally, though Cicero mentions the case in his rhetorical works, it was clearly of no importance

<sup>1</sup> Suet. *Jul.* 19. 2. This, incidentally, is often misunderstood. It is clearly a traditional formula and means the suppression of brigandage in Italy, such as occurred even in the second century B.C. For a proconsul doing odd jobs in Gaul, see the inscription of Sex. Atilius Sarnanus, the consul of 136 (J.L.S. 5945). But we do not know what

his *provincia* had been—*Italia* is as likely as Gaul.

<sup>2</sup> App. *B.C.* i. 19. For what Roman magistrates could do in Italy, cf. C. Gracchus *op. Gall.* x. 3. 2 f.

<sup>3</sup> On Scaurus' family and his struggle to establish himself, see Bloch, *M. Aem. Scaurus*, pp. 3 f.

either in legal or in political history—being only a private quarrel between two bad-tempered men (cf. Cic. *Br.* 113)—and no other source bothers to refer to it. Surely this is an odd precedent for Mam. Scaurus to cite in the same breath with the other two.

It should now be obvious that there is something wrong with this example. Once we recognize that Mam. Scaurus can hardly have intended to refer to the *ambitus* case of 116 B.C., we may proceed to look for what he did have in mind. This—as will be clear from our analysis—must be a notorious *repetundae* case: nothing else would have fitted into the series and served his own purpose. Now, though M. Scaurus at times gave evidence in such cases, we do not actually know of any *repetundae* case in which he prosecuted: thus the approach through the person of the prosecutor is unrewarding. Let us, however, consider the accused: the name of P. Rutilius Rufus calls to mind one of the best known of all *repetundae* cases.<sup>1</sup> After serving as Q. Mucius Scaevola's legate in Asia, Rutilius was prosecuted and condemned through the machinations of Marius and the *Equites*. His conviction and exile helped to shape the programme of M. Livius Drusus for his tribunate (Asc., p. 21 Clark) and thus led to—though, of course, it was not properly the cause of—the Social War.<sup>2</sup> If we make the assumption that M. Scaurus was the prosecutor of Rutilius in this famous case, everything at once falls into place most admirably: Scaurus, by that time, had been *princeps senatus* for a generation and was one of the most powerful men in Rome (cf. Cic. *Font.* 24)—far higher in dignity and power than any private citizen could hope to be under the Empire; and the case was a *repetundae* case of outstanding importance and fame. Admittedly, Rutilius was claimed to be the victim of a miscarriage of justice, and encomiastic tradition—based ultimately on his own writings and those of Cicero, the pupil of his friend Scaevola—finally prevailed. But a descendant of the prosecutor, in ordinary *pietas*, quite apart from the interest of the moment, would have to claim that his ancestor had championed a just cause against a guilty man; and the audience would take that implication for granted. The conclusion seems inevitable: it must have been this case—the case of P. Rutilius Rufus, in the memory of men—that Mam. Scaurus was citing as his precedent, implying that his great-grandfather was the successful prosecutor.

We seem to have arrived at a fact of cardinal importance for the interpretation of Roman politics at the beginning of the first century B.C.—of such importance, indeed, that, since it is not anywhere directly attested, the witness must be carefully examined. He does not stand up well under examination. Not only does it seem unlikely that the old *princeps senatus*, crippled with gout, would voluntarily have taken upon himself the strain of a major political prosecution<sup>3</sup>—and this without arousing any comment whatever in the numerous sources on the trial;<sup>4</sup> but, as it happens, we know the name of Rutilius' prosecutor: he was a man called Apicius—no doubt a member of the equestrian clique whom Rutilius and Scaevola had annoyed—whose

<sup>1</sup> Broughton (*M.R.R.* ii. 8–9) lists over thirty references to the case.

<sup>2</sup> On all this see *Athenaeum*, 1956, pp. 104 f., especially 117 f.

<sup>3</sup> On his state of health see Asc., p. 22 Cl. His *delatio* of Q. Caepio in 92 was a tactical manoeuvre, not meant to result in a real trial.

<sup>4</sup> See n. 1 (above). The argument from silence here surely seems justified. Cf., e.g., Cic. *Br.* 110 f.: a parallel treatment of Scaurus and Rutilius, describing their clash in 116, then going on to discuss Rutilius' showing at his trial in 92 without a word of Scaurus.



reputation has suffered accordingly.<sup>1</sup> This evidence, both positive and negative, is further confirmed by analysis of the political situation in the nineties (for which, see my article cited above): by then the old quarrel between Scaurus and Rutilius had long been forgotten amid the continuous shifting of political alliances; they were both in the same closely knit faction, centred in the Metelli and opposed to Marius, who had tried to strike at them through the trial of Rutilius (Dio, fr. 97.3); in fact, Scaurus, so far from being one of Rutilius' enemies, was marked out to be the next victim after his fall.<sup>2</sup> The weight of all this varied evidence is decisive: M. Scaurus cannot have prosecuted Rutilius in 92 B.C.

Yet, as we have seen, only the assumption that he did will make sense of Mam. Scaurus' list of precedents. Is Tacitus wrong? It would not be the only time: as a source for Republican history he is not above inaccuracy and is, at the best, as good as his source in each case.<sup>3</sup> Here, however, his source was probably reliable enough: for an important debate in the Senate he would either look up the *acta Senatus* or at least rely on 'scriptores senatoresque eorundem temporum'.<sup>4</sup> We may take it that Mam. Scaurus did recite his list of precedents and must be held responsible for it. Can we attribute such an error to the great-grandson of M. Scaurus himself?

There is no reason why we should not. About the character of Mam. Scaurus many harsh things were said, not only in his own day and century,<sup>5</sup> but in fact centuries later.<sup>6</sup> *Suggestio falsi*, never alien to Roman oratory even in its most virtuous exponents, would not surprise us in his case. In an action that was bound to make him unpopular, a *domesticum exemplum* of this kind was worth having: if he found a reference to his ancestor's prosecution of Rutilius in the family archives (as we have seen, the case was probably no longer a matter of general knowledge), he was not above moulding it to his purpose by means of a little *contaminatio*. Yet, on the whole, a more lenient view suggests itself as more probable: from what we know of the man, simple ignorance is the best explanation. For though he was by nature one of the most gifted speakers of his time, we learn from the elder Seneca that laziness was his besetting sin: he would often prepare his cases when actually in court. As a result he missed true greatness: 'eo illum longa, immo perpetua, desidia perduxerat ut nihil curare uellet, nihil posset.' Nor was this confined to his forensic speeches: his *libelli* (whatever they were) 'caloris minus habent, neglegentiae non minus'.<sup>7</sup> It is only to be expected that such a man, when citing precedent, should fail to verify his references and should confuse his facts. Nor is it surprising that, being the man he was, he should be ignorant of the details of his own great-grandfather's career. We remember another well-known great-grandson—degenerate perhaps, but hardly in the same class as

<sup>1</sup> Posidonius *ap.* Athen. iv. 66 (168 D): this cannot really mean anything but that Apicius was Rutilius' prosecutor. That the *princeps senatus* acted as *subscriptor* to the Roman Knight is inconceivable.

<sup>2</sup> Asc., loc. cit.;—cf. *Athenaeum*, 1956, pp. 117 f.

<sup>3</sup> For examples of inaccuracy and misleading formulation, see *Ann.* iii. 26 f. (a 'history' of legislation in Rome); xi. 22 (a history of the quaestorship); xii. 60 (the

judiciary laws); and, on a minor biographical matter, xiii. 6 (Pompey's age).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Ann.* ii. 88. Tacitus' methods are treated in all the standard editions.

<sup>5</sup> Apart from Tacitus (loc. cit., and vi. 29: 'uita probrosus'), see especially Sen. *Ben.* iv. 31.

<sup>6</sup> Tert. *De Pallio* 5, *fn.*, must refer to him.

<sup>7</sup> See Seneca's long discussion of him in *Contr.* x, *praef.* 2-3.

Mam. Scaurus—who was guilty of much more flagrant public ἀνιστορησία: none other than Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (see Cic. *Att.* vi. 1, 17).

Thus we have lost our unexpected 'fact' from the history of the late Republic. Yet our inquiry has not been in vain. It has not only made sense of a passage of Tacitus, but thrown some light on the character of Mam. Aemilius Scaurus; and it has quite unexpectedly illustrated one of the elder Seneca's judgements, which only too often we have to take on trust.

Durham Colleges, University of Durham

E. BADIAN

### SOPHOCLES, PHILOCTETES 782

ΦΙ. ἀλλὰ δέδοικ' ὦ παῖ μὴ μ' ἀτελὴς εὐχῆ.

Thus the main manuscript tradition transmits the line. The difficulty is summed up by Jebb: 'In the whole passage from 730 to 826 the series of iambic trimeters is otherwise unbroken, save by those brief cries of Philoctetes which occur "extra metrum".' The line is, in fact, a solitary dochmiac dimeter in an unparalleled position; the two and a half dochmiac dimeters which begin an iambic speech in Euripides' *Hippolytus* ll. 88a ff. have been led up to by a mixture of dochmiacs and iambs which occurs a page earlier. Also, although Philoctetes is agitated here, his excitement is scarcely parallel to that of Theseus in the *Hippolytus*, who finds himself in a situation designed to arouse even the most stoic of tragic heroes to explosive speech and action.

This difficulty has reduced most editors to one of two expedients—violent emendation, examples of which range from Jebb's ἀλλ' ὅσος ὦ παῖ μὴ ἀτελεσθ' <εὐχῇ μ' ἔχει> to Hermann's ἀλλ' οὐ τι σοί, παῖ, μὴ ἀτελὴς εὐχῇ πέλῃ, or, even more arbitrary, to the assumption that the line as we have it is simply a scribe's fill-in for a line that had somehow fallen out; but, if this latter were the explanation, it would seem strange that the scribe could not have produced a more grammatical and straightforward line; μ' especially is an intolerable solecism.

The μὴ clause really requires a verb; εὐχῇ has been suggested, and, indeed, it is not hard to see how this might have slipped out after εὐχῆ; the μ' could be taken as an inept scribe's insertion to relieve the seeming hiatus between μὴ and ἀτελὴς. This would make the second half of the line metrical, and it was read by Wunder, followed by Pearson in the Oxford text, with δέδοικα δ', ὦ παῖ at the beginning.

But Wunder, in his treatment of the first

half of the line, is too arbitrary. If the word ἀλλὰ is to be omitted, its inclusion in the line by the scribe must be accounted for. Apart from this, his solution is the simplest one.

The answer seems to lie in the context. Philoctetes, as his words signify, is just beginning to feel his pain coming on again after a short period of relief. Once before in the play the onset of the agony has been described, and in l. 732 has been shown Philoctetes' reaction to the first pangs. There and seven lines later he cried the cry of incipient pain—δ δ δ δ.

Perhaps the two most easily confused of Greek letters in uncials are Α and Λ. So it is not hard to imagine a scribe, finding the words ΑΑΑΑΔΕΔΟΙΚΑΔΩ before him, transcribing them as ἀλλὰ δέδοικα δ' ὦ. From this beginning the further deterioration of the text can easily be imagined. The δ' would be left out through its similarity in uncials to a or, more probably, because of its obvious superfluity with ἀλλὰ at the beginning of the line; next, the impossibility of δέδοικα ὦ would be rectified by a simple elision. In the second half, μ' would be inserted and εὐχῇ would fall out by haplography.

The δ' would seem called for in that Philoctetes is contradicting a wish expressed by Neoptolemus, and occurs elsewhere after an exclamation of this kind (*O.C.* 1427, etc.; cf. *Phil.* 934; Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 172).

Line 782 can now be read:

δ δ δ δ.

δέδοικα δ', ὦ παῖ, μὴ ἀτελὴς εὐχῇ <εὐχῇ>.

We can now read again with renewed confidence Jebb's comment: 'In the whole passage from 730 to 826 the series of iambic trimeters is otherwise unbroken, save by those brief cries of Philoctetes which occur "extra metrum".'

Pembroke College,  
Cambridge

R. H. PHILP

## PLATO, SYMPOSIUM

195 D, E

"Ὁμηρος γὰρ Ἀτῆν θεὸν τέ φησιν εἶναι καὶ ἀπαλήν—τοὺς γούν ποδας αὐτῆς ἀπαλοὺς εἶναι—λέγων

τῆς μὲν<sup>1</sup> ἀπαλοὶ ποδες· οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' οὐδεὸς πίπνυται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἡ γὲ κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράτα βαίνει. καλῶ οὖν δοκεῖ μοι τεκμηρίον τὴν ἀπαλόγητα ἀποφαίνειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ σκληροῦ βαίνει, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μαλθακοῦ. τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς χρῆσόμεθα τεκμηρίον περὶ Ἐρώτα ὅτι ἀπαλός. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς βαίνει οὐδ' ἐπὶ κρανίων, ἀ ἔστιν οὐ πᾶν μαλακὰ, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μαλακωτάτοις τῶν ὄντων καὶ βαίνει καὶ οἰκεῖ.

As far as the words οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς βαίνει, Agathon treats Homer's words about Ate as affording a perfect justification for the inference which he draws about Eros, namely that his ἀπαλότης can be inferred from the fact that he does not tread on hard things. At this point, however, he suddenly affects to notice that Homer, though he says that Ate's feet are ἀπαλοί, says nothing about her walking on soft things, but on the contrary states that she treads on things that cannot possibly be called soft, namely human skulls.

As the text stands, Agathon is content to mark this unexpected observation by a simple οὐδέ (οὐδ' ἐπὶ κρανίων). It is true that Plato sometimes uses οὐδέ, following οὐ, to mean 'nor even' or the like: Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 193, quotes *Rep.* 347 D, οὐκ ἔχοντες ἑαυτῶν βελτίους ἐπιτρέφει οὐδέ ὁμοίους but in that passage that there is not, as there is here, a sharp note of self-correction.

I suggest that in *Symp.* 195 E Plato wrote οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς βαίνει οὐδέ γ' ἐπὶ κρανίων: 'for he does not walk on the ground, nor, for the matter of that, on skulls'.

This is a common Platonic idiom. Denniston (*ibid.*, p. 156) lists nine Platonic examples of connective οὐδέ γε in continuous speech meaning 'nor yet', 'and not either', namely *Charm.* 163 B, 165 E, *Clit.* 407 B, *Phaedo* 97 A, 106 B (*bis*), *Theaet.* 175 E, 180 A, 207 E. In all these examples γε immediately follows οὐδέ. In *Theaet.* 175 B Burnet records that one important manuscript, W, has dropped γε (before ἀμυνίαν): in *Symp.* 195 E its accidental omission (before ἐπὶ) would be graphically even easier.

D. S. ROBERTSON

Trinity College, Cambridge

## THEOPHRASTUS

Περὶ λίθων, 25

τῶν δὲ . . . ἀνῶν καλουμένων ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἢ ἐν Τύρῳ μεγίστη, στήλη γὰρ ἔστιν εὐμεγέθης

ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἱερῷ· εἰ μὴ ἄρα φεοῖτο σμαράγδος.

τῶν Turnebus, Caley and Richards; Βακτριανῶν Furlanus, Wimmer (Teubner, Didot).

With τῶν δὲ understand σμαράγδων: 'Of those (*smaragdi*) known to many as . . . , the largest is the one at Tyre, where a great block stands in the temple of Heracles, unless indeed this is a false smaragdus.'

Sections 23-27 are devoted to a discussion of various kinds of *smaragdi*, none of which in fact appears to be a genuine emerald. For example, the stones from Cyprus and Demonesus (25-26) were malachite, while the large *smaragdi* used in Egypt for obelisks (24) were probably green basalt or green Aswan granite. The term *smaragdus* here, as in other classical writings, covers a number of green minerals, and we must bear this fact in mind as we attempt to repair the gap in the passage quoted above.

Neither of the conjectures proposed is at all satisfactory.

1. τῶν at first sight is plausible, for Pliny (xxxvii. 74) includes the *tanos* among his *smaragdi*. It is described (l.c.) as a Persian stone of an unattractive green colour, and may be the green turquoise (S. H. Ball, *A Roman Book of Precious Stones*, Los Angeles, 1950, p. 145). But a fatal objection lies in the phrase καλουμένων ὑπὸ πολλῶν. It is inconceivable that an exotic term like *tanos* was used by many people in Greece at any period whatsoever.

2. This objection does not perhaps apply so forcibly to Βακτριανῶν, even though we may find difficulty in supposing that it was a term known to many people. But what were these Bactrian *smaragdi*? Attempts have been made to identify them with the stones discussed by Theophrastus in 35, where he writes: 'Those stones used in inlay work come from the neighbourhood of the Bactrian Desert and are collected by expeditions of men on horseback in the season of the Etesians, when the strong winds shift the sand and expose them to view. The stones are small, or at any rate not large' (οἷς δὲ εἰς τὰ λιθοκόλλητα . . . οὐ μεγάλοι).

Pliny, who gives a garbled paraphrase of this passage (xxxvii. 65), appears to have assumed, quite gratuitously, that the stones are *smaragdi*. Either he or one of his authorities supposed that οἷς δὲ, κατὰ, must refer to the previous sentence καὶ ἐν Κύπρῳ ἢ τε σμαράγδος καὶ ἡ ἱασμῆς. It would have been more logical for him to suppose that the Bactrian stones were *iaspides*.<sup>1</sup> However, it

<sup>1</sup> *iasmῆς* cannot be equated with jasper any more than *σμαράγδος* with emerald.

seems clear that Theophrastus is dealing with a fresh topic quite unconnected with *σμάραγδος* or, for that matter, *laconis*. He is presumably referring to one of the blue stones, either lapis lazuli or blue turquoise, commonly used in Persian inlay work. Since lapis lazuli is described elsewhere (as *σάπφειρος*), it is virtually certain that in 35 Theophrastus is retailing a fanciful description of the source of the blue turquoise mined near Nishapur and the Great Salt Desert in North East Persia. Blue turquoise could never have ranked as a *smaragdus*, for the term, however widely it was used, was restricted to green minerals. Moreover, the *smaragdi* under discussion could obviously occur in pieces of some size, whereas the Bactrian stones of 35 'are small, or at any rate not large'. It is impossible to justify *Βακτριανῶν* by appealing to 35 or to the corresponding passage in Pliny, and there is no support to be obtained for it elsewhere.

To fill the gap satisfactorily, we require a word which, unlike *Βακτριανῶν*, refers to a green stone, and, unlike *τάων*, could have been known widely in Greece when Theophrastus was writing. Needless to say, it should end in *-αίων* or something very like it.

Such a word is *λακωνίων*, if we may be allowed to assume that *α* has disappeared after *α*, which does not seem altogether impossible. Before *αίων* the best manuscript, A, shows a lacuna of three letters.

'The *smaragdi* known to many as "Laconian"' would be the green porphyry (*verde antico*) from the quarries at Croceae near the modern Levetsova, a village lying on high ground between the main ridge of Taygetus and the Eurotas, about 15 miles south of Sparta on the road to Gytheum. The stone, which is not known to occur elsewhere in Greece, is described by Frazer (*Pausanias' Description of Greece*, iii. 374) as having a rich green ground speckled with rectangular greenish-white crystals, and as being difficult to work, but capable of taking a fine polish. Pausanias (iii. 21. 4) states that there is no continuous mass of rock, but only pebbles. These, according to Frazer, are seldom as much as a foot long and a few inches thick. Pliny (xxxvi. 55) calls this stone *marmor Lacedaemonium*. The one Greek title known to us, although there may have been others, is *ἀλάκωνα λίθος* (Lucian, *Hippias* 5, *οἶκος* . . . *ἀλακὼν λίθος κεκοσμημένος*). This gives strong support to *λακωνίων* and removes any objection to the effect that *λακωνίων* would be a more natural word, although this too was no doubt used. Pliny implies as much when he refers in his chapter

on *smaragdi* to *Laconici* dug on Mt. Taygetus (xxxvii. 73).<sup>1</sup> Pliny also implies that pieces of green porphyry were known as *smaragdi*.<sup>2</sup> Thus, combining the evidence from Lucian and Pliny, we can feel assured that *ἀλάκωνα σμάραγδος* was a phrase that Theophrastus could well have had in mind.

Considerable use was made of *marmor Lacedaemonium* at Knossos and Mycenae (*B.S.A.* viii. 78 and xxiv. 201), and again in the time of the Roman Empire (Lucian, l.c.; Statius, *Silvae* i. 2. 148-9 and ii. 2. 90-91; Martial vi. 42. 11, *illuc Taygeti vivunt metalla*: a piece was found in a small villa at Ely, near Cardiff, *J.R.S.* xxii. 125). There is, however, little or no evidence of its use in the intervening period. Nevertheless, once discovered, it is not likely to have been forgotten. It is one of the most colourful stones of Greece and may at all times have aroused interest as a curiosity, if for no other reason. Unlike the *tanais*, it could have been known widely in Greece in Theophrastus' time.

If *λακωνίων* can be accepted, it follows that in Theophrastus' view the block of *smaragdus* at Tyre, mentioned also by Herodotus (ii. 44), was green porphyry or something like it (*εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ ψευδὸς σμάραγδος*). How and Wells (*Commentary on Herodotus*, i. 188) do not consider this possibility, but suggest that it was a piece of green jasper or malachite.

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

## THE EARTHS OF THEOPHRASTUS

THE NEW English translation of Theophrastus' *περὶ λίθων* by Earle R. Caley and John F. C. Richards, is a most welcome event, though it is sad to reflect that a translation

<sup>1</sup> *compleures uero e proximis* (sc. *auctoribus affirmant*) *et Laconicos in Taygeto monte erui*, etc. Mayhoff, on the authority of B alone, omits *Laconicos*. The omission was due, however, to a misunderstanding of *proximis*, with which in B we find *montibus* supplied. Hence B read in *proximis montibus et in Taygeto*, and so crowded out *Laconicos*. (Pliny makes *smaragdus* masculine.)

<sup>2</sup> There seems no reason to doubt that the *smaragdi Laconici* were green porphyry. C. E. N. Bromehead (*Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*, lvi. 113) lists a number of the stones included by Pliny and others under *smaragdus*. When he mentions green porphyry among them, he must be thinking of this passage.



by D. E. Eichholz<sup>1</sup> and Stanley Smith, begun about 1942 in this country, was never completed.

The translators in their copious notes steer their way very skilfully through the varieties of Tymphaic earth or γέφος, showing when lime, when gypsum, and when plaster of Paris was meant. Of the other three earths, the Melian, the Kimolian, and the Samian, only the last is, in my view, convincingly translated as kaolinite, as it was by Bailey.<sup>2</sup>

Among kaolinitic clays one can find contrasts in physical properties: thus if Samian earth were dense, shiny, greasy—because of the size, shape, and mode of compaction of the platelets—there is no reason to suppose that another kaolinitic clay could not be light, harsh and, when rubbed, clinkery-sounding. As γέφος covered several materials so I believe could Melian earth.

I agree that the exceedingly fine-grained quartz now called 'Milowite' may have been sold as Μηλιάς in Theophrastus' time, but consider it equally probable that a very

white kaolinitic clay somewhat indurated with fine silica might also have found use as a pigment in his day and later. (The reflectance of a specimen I examined by a standard test was 92 per cent., compared with 88 per cent. for a paper-coating china-clay from Cornwall and 82 per cent. for another from Georgia, U.S.A.) A painter would avoid a shiny, white pigment and would choose one which would give a matt surface.

It is, however, quite possible that Pliny's depilatory brand of Melinum (*N.H.* xxxv. 37) could be the abrasive fine silica 'Milowite'.

Kimolian earth cannot be sepiolite (= meerschaum), a mineral which can be used as a fuller's earth only locally because when it is extracted and allowed to dry it becomes exceedingly hard and tough: it no longer forms a slurry when mixed with water. There can be no doubt whatsoever that Kimolian earth, like English fuller's earth, was essentially calcium-montmorillonite.<sup>3</sup> Although Kimolos supplied the classical world with one of its most important detergents, shiploads of this mineral can still be bought from those parts of Melos nearest to the smaller island. The mineral name *cimolite* is obsolete.

R. H. S. ROBERTSON

<sup>1</sup> See, however, D. E. Eichholz, *C.R.*, lxxvi (1952), 144–5; lix (1945), 52.

<sup>2</sup> K. C. Bailey, *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects*, ii (1932).

<sup>3</sup> R. H. S. Robertson, *C.R.* lxxiii (1949), 51.

## REVIEWS

### EARLY GREEK ELEGIAC AND IAMBIC POETRY

FRANCISCO R. ADRADOS: *Líricos Griegos: Elegíacos y Yambógrafos Arcaicos (siglos vii–v a. C.)*. Volumen i. (Colección Hispánica de Autores Griegos y Latinos.) Pp. xxii + 251. Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1956 [1957]. Cloth.

The plan of the book is promising. There is a short general introduction (pp. ix–xxv) followed by a general bibliography. Then for each poet (Archilochus, Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Semonides, Solon, Mimnermus, Phocylides, Demodocus, and—as if this were a work of the sixth century—Asius fr. 1) a special introduction and bibliography; text with translation opposite; beneath the text, sources and very brief apparatus criticus; beneath the translation, short explanatory notes. Introductions, translations, and explanatory notes are in Spanish.

The general introduction and (especially) the introduction to Archilochus, with which one starts, make a favourable impression. The editor, who has read

widely and written much about Archilochus, here summarizes the outcome; and though the reader may growl at certain exposed bones of contention, he may well judge the whole to be lucid and moderate; pp. 15-19 in particular draw a good portrait of Archilochus. This poet is indeed the editor's special interest: the introductions to the others are very short (eight pages for Solon, seven each for Tyrtaeus and Mimnermus) and more or less conventional; though there are matters debatable enough, it is clear that the editor has not reached his conclusions without much reading and much thought, and within these narrow limits he could not have done much more or much differently.

Though the book as a whole is designed (or so I suppose) primarily for university students at undergraduate level, the professional scholar will turn to it with gratitude for the sake of its bibliographies (127 items for Arch., 96 for Solon, 40 each for Sem. and Mimn.); moreover he will find the explanatory notes occasionally of interest, and some novel interpretations latent in the translations.

As for the texts, I am sorry now to have to report that these are (for more than one reason) far from satisfactory.

(i) It is high time that editors of lyric and elegiac and iambic poets ceased to draw the line between quotation and allusion, excluding the latter from their selections. To give a single instance: The sources quoted in fr. 147 (Bergk) tell us all that we know about the interesting Nessus-Deianeira poem: the editor refers to these in his notes but does not copy them out; instead, he gives us (as his 'Epode XII') six direct quotations, not one of which is attested as coming from the poem in question. The truth is that some of the most interesting facts about the work of these authors are contained in allusions and paraphrases which happen not to include direct quotation; it would be much better to give the text of what is known, and refer to mere guesses in the notes, than vice versa.

(ii) 'Epode XII' is characteristic in another respect also. The editor has defended elsewhere his reconstructions of the Epodes, the Pericles-poem, the Neoboule-incident: he is perfectly aware that these reconstructions are highly speculative, though he presumably thinks them much less shaky than I do. I point to 'Epode XII', composed of fragments *all* hypothetically assigned; 'Epode IX', three fragments, of which the second and third are not the work of Archilochus (correctly assigned to Cratinus by the sources; p. 31 Demianczuk; i, p. 14 Kock), while the first arbitrarily conjoins two fragments separately attested; 'Epode III', eight fragments *all* of doubtful assignment, a few of uncertain authorship, one of them a mere modern fiction. It is one thing to speculate on unverifiable possibilities within the covers of periodicals; quite another thing to present the results in a book of which the primary purpose must surely be to serve as a teaching manual. The editor may remind us that much is doubtful: but the ever-present text looks so much more authoritative than the occasional words—or even the regular asterisks—of caution. Entirely false impressions are easily created—that we possess many more fragments of Archilochus than we do, and that we know a great deal more about individual poems than we do. I cannot stress too emphatically the excessively speculative nature of these reconstructions: their place is in periodicals or monographs which none but the professional scholar is likely to read.

(iii) But my principal complaint is that the texts (especially of Archilochus) are shockingly disfigured by errors and misprints. The number of these is so

great, and their character sometimes so repellent, that the utility of the book seems to me seriously diminished. Among oversights which ruin the metre note especially Arch. 76 τοῖνδ' ὦ for τοῖνδε δ' ὦ; 158. 18 τανύσωντες for τανύσσω; 170. 6 δειδώς for δειδ-; Tyr. 6. 16 ἀρχεσθε for ἀρχετε; Sem. 8. 5 ἀπλούτοις for -λύτ-; Solon 7. 3 ἐμὲ σὺν for ἐμὲ ξὺν; 19. 12 ὁμῶς left out; 28. 1 εὐχάμεθα for -μεσθα; Phoc. 7. 1 χρῆζων for trisyllabic χρῆζων; add two peculiar categories, (a) the printing of ε for η, Arch. 72 σιδερέη, 206. 10 Ἀρχε- for Ἀρχη-, metre not affected; Tyr. 7. 1 Ἡρακλέος for -ῆος; Mimn. 11. 5 Αἰετόδ [sic]; Solon 2. 3 and Sem. 8. 71 δέ for δή; the reverse error disfigures Arch. 216. 1 μῆθυ, Tyr. 1. 54 n. ἡγημόσιν, Sem. 8. 29 ἐπαινῆσει; (b) metre ruined by omission of paragogic *nu*, Arch. 177. 8, 211. 1, Solon 5. 7, 11. 6, Sem. 8. 72; and by its inclusion, Arch. 164, Solon 1. 37. In the following examples the fault evidently is not always to be charged to the printer: Arch. 53. 3, Porson's law broken (the lines are by Lasserre, not Archilochus); 120. 2, no caesura (again, the line is not by Archilochus); 132. 10 - - - - - κακῶς φαί- - -; 132. 12, [σ]ε[θ] ὅς, hiatus supplied by the editor (in the next line the unmetrical νῦν is presumably a mere misprint); 133. 6, σὺν ονη-; 133. 9 - - - [ε] παρ[ρὸς τ]ραφεῖσα τ[- - -], no caesura; 158. 9 -έντες χερσὶν δ[ (the bracket is the wrong way round in the text), four consecutive long syllables; 158. 13, no diaeresis in the middle of the line; 158. 14 - - - - - ] με [τε]ήραν εἰμένη καλ[ήν]; 208. 1, περί-φθμος?; Callinus 2. 1, short syllable before σμυρν-; Sem. 8. 43, πολῆς? Here are some three dozen places where the text as printed does not scan: I have not included quite all that I have noted, and I do not guarantee that I have noticed all.

The text is further disfigured by such aberrations as Arch. 163. 3 χειμόνος; 171. 2 κρεῖνναμένος; 220. 2 ἐκούων; 230 τριοῖζύρην; Solon 1. 48 λατρύει; 23. 3 ἀγασθεῖν; Sem. 8. 34 ἀμῖ; more insidious are Solon 1. 14, ὅς for ὥς, and Sem. 2. 11 λαβὼν for λαβόν. Smaller misprints are common (in the bibliographies too); punctuation is sometimes erratic (e.g. Arch. 7. 5 and 8; 160; Callinus 1. 5); and without special search I have marked forty-nine errors of accent or breathing. Much more distressing are such monsters as Sem. 8. 116, ἐποίησεν, a remarkable lapse for ἀμφέθηκεν, and Sem. 2. 13 δαμνημένους (!) for δεδμημένους. And what is one to say about Νηλεῦς (nominative) in Arch. 154. 6 and 7? Or ἀμηχάνη in Arch. 124. 10? In the translation, *oyendo la voz* for φωνήν κλύσας in Arch. 28. 9 gave me such a shock that I read much of the translation with considerable care, but without any comparable result; on the contrary, I found it as lucid and accurate as the nature of the material permits.

Finally, the representation of papyrus-texts needs drastic revision throughout. I give a single characteristic specimen, Arch. 128 = P. Oxy. 2310 fr. 3: line 2, delete bracket after με (in general, there are too many brackets accidentally omitted or included or turned back to front); line 7, omitted stop after ε; line 9, placed too far to the right (in general, the relative positions of lines are often haphazard); line 10, accent should not be there, a stop should; line 11, accent omitted; line 13, δακ[ρύεις] is, if not actually impossible, too risky to put into the text; line 14, one extra missing letter is marked; lines 16 and 17, these speculative readings should be relegated to the notes; line 18, ]ος προ[ does not represent what is in the papyrus ([. . .]ό[. . .]), even if the letters σπο were reliable (and they are not); line 19, badly misplaced in relation to the line above.

It is a great pity that the reader's confidence in a book potentially—and in some respects actually—so attractive and useful should be so severely shaken by his observation that there are some hundreds of corrections, major and minor, to be made before he can concentrate on reading. Moreover, the present book is *Volume 1*: I implore the editor to re-double vigilance over subsequent volumes.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. L. PAGE

## FRAGMENTS OF HESIOD

REINHOLD MERKELBACH: *Die Hesiodfragmente auf Papyrus*. Pp. 56; 6 plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Paper, DM. 6.40.

OUR store of Hesiod fragments on papyri has grown steadily in recent years: Merkelbach now gives us twenty-three, as against Rzach's nine in 1913. Although there is no reason to suppose that the mine is now exhausted, the present edition, assembling material hitherto scattered in periodicals, and by a scholar who has already done important pioneer work, will be generally welcomed.

There has been a broad measure of agreement about which fragments can be considered genuinely Hesiodic. Of doubtful ones, Merkelbach includes the single-word fragment from P. Oxy. 1087 of *Κήρυκος γάμος*, a poem whose genuineness was disputed in antiquity (cf., for different views, Ath. ii 49b with Plut. *Mor.* 730e). On the other hand, he excludes P. Mich. 11 (cf. *T.A.P.A.* liii. 133 ff.), which Körte rightly questioned: Page included it in his appendix to the Loeb Hesiod, but agreed that 'the grounds for attribution to Hesiod are too slight'. Merkelbach sometimes suppresses scholars' doubts about certain fragments, e.g. N, which Rzach labelled 'fragmentum dubium', and M 2, whose attribution to the Hesiodic Catalogue was questioned by Robert: and we might perhaps have had more discussion of the genuineness of the lines in F 4 (26-33) which are athetized in the papyrus itself, especially the difficulty pointed out by Körte at 28 (Merkelbach simply says '*ἀγχιος* statt *ἀγχιος* ungewöhnlich').

Merkelbach gives two separate series of notes, one containing full information about the papyrus text, the other concerned with conjectural supplements, parallels, and comments on particular points of subject-matter. The palaeographical notes are the product of minute and careful work. The facsimiles (mostly reduced to four-fifths of the original size) vary in clarity, but are good at their best; occasionally one can note minor disagreements with the readings as reported; e.g. E 2. 14 the  $\pi$  of a possible *ἐνέβησαν* or *ἐνέβησαν* seems discernible. Merkelbach would, however, have helped the palaeographer by giving possible dates for the papyri, and the mythologist by discussing the order of fragments of the same papyrus (e.g. F).

As regards supplements, 'im Text habe ich etwas mehr ergänzt als heute üblich ist; in dieser weitgehend formelhaften Poesie stört eine sinngemäß richtige, im Wortlaut aber nicht treffende Ergänzung den stilistischen Eindruck weniger als dies bei anderen Dichtern der Fall ist'. Even so, Merkelbach generally handles conjectural supplements with caution: this is not at all an 'all my own work' edition, and the great majority of Merkelbach's own conjectures are concerned with style rather than substance. His standard of



strictness is sometimes unexpectedly relaxed, e.g. E 1 init., I (where Merkelbach rightly stressed the uncertainty in *Aegyptus*, xxxi. 254 ff.), and IV, and, on a small point, the accusative γυν[αῖκα in M 5. Supplements with strong claims are occasionally kept in the apparatus, e.g. H 75 Rzach's ὄσσα τ' ἔην.

Merkelbach generally gives a full account of the work of his predecessors, though he does occasionally mislead the reader. For instance, at H 38-39, the whole of Evelyn-White's suggestion *Τυνδάρεος δὲ ἀναξ, ὁπόσοι κίον εἵνεκα κούρης, | οὐτ' ἀπέπεμφεν ἑκὼν οὐτ' [αὐθ'] ἔλε [δῶρον ἔ]κ[α]σ[του]* might have been mentioned, and at H 78 it is relevant that Rzach proposed 'v. 82 ante 78 collocato scripserim: οὐ γὰρ τις σάφα ᾗδε', ὅτι. At K 1. 25 Evelyn-White explicitly preferred an alternative restoration to the one quoted for him by Merkelbach, and at K 1. 29 Merkelbach quotes Rzach as saying that 'μετὰ mit dem Genitiv ist unepisch' but does not tell us that Rzach met this difficulty by reading τόθ' Ἑκτορος. (Incidentally, what Rzach said was 'μετὰ mit dem Gen. für das archaische Epos ausgeschlossen ist': and even in its original form this statement seems to require qualification.) In particular, scholars are often not given credit for the greatly varying degrees of certainty with which they proposed their restorations, e.g. Rzach in H. A few emendations are misattributed, e.g. C 2 δ' add. Rzach; E 1. 9 Λεύκωνος suppl. Terzaghi; K 1. 12 εὐήφεν]έων coni. Allen (coll. Ψ 81).

The selection of suggestions for mention in an apparatus must inevitably be often a matter of opinion, but Merkelbach too often gives space to suggestions to which there is a definite objection, raised by himself or by someone he quotes: e.g. A 13, where he suggests a supplement with ἀθανάτων ἰότητι, which Lobel explicitly rejects as apparently incompatible with the traces (Lobel's interpretation of the context here seems more convincing). Some suggestions quoted seem doubtful on stylistic grounds, e.g. Schmidt's at K 2. 11 (ἀτμεύουσιν), where Rzach's restoration might have been mentioned. Conversely we may feel that some suggestions have been undeservedly excluded, e.g. F 4. 4-5 αὐτ[ῶ] ἴ[σο]ν Ἀρηί [τέκεν φιλότῃ μεγίστῃ | ξανθοκόμῃ]ν Μελέαγρον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερὸν τε (Franz), K 1. 22 πέμπε δέ μιν Τροίηνδε (Evelyn-White), R 3 ὠκυπόδων σθένος ἔππ[ων] (Franz).

The bibliographies are an excellent guide to previous work, though Merkelbach might have mentioned J. U. Powell's appendix to *New Chapters in Greek Literature*, ii. 189 ff., especially in connexion with F 4.

There are some excellent notes on mythological problems, with apposite quotations, e.g. on D 15, but the reader who concluded that every difficulty is covered might be misled, e.g. on M 2 (is 3 Λέλεγος) χθονίοιο at all certain?) and N, and occasionally we need more information, e.g. F 5. 4.

The standard of mechanical accuracy is very high; there are a few minor slips, e.g. C bibliography: Bartoletti, *Studi Italiani* 1946; K 1 init.; Tafel II (not VI); F 5. 3 adn. ἐμᾶτο (accent).

An index nominum would have enhanced the usefulness of an edition of a text primarily of interest to mythologists.

## PANDORA

OTTO LENDLE: *Die 'Pandorasage' bei Hesiod. Textkritische und Moti-  
geschichtliche Untersuchungen.* Pp. 140; 9 plates. Würzburg: Triltsch,  
1957. Paper, DM. 4.80.

LIKE many other readers of Hesiod, Lendle finds difficulties in *W.D.* 60-82. Zeus bids Hephaistos make a woman out of wet earth (clay), and assigns various deities their parts in completing the work. *οὐδ' ἐπιθόωτο*, adds the poet (69), but they do not, only Hephaistos and Hermes obeying Zeus, while Athene dresses the woman instead of teaching her to weave and Aphrodite does nothing at all. Still, the business is somehow finished and the new creature is named Pandora, interpreted as 'recipient of all gifts', whereas it should mean 'giver of all gifts' and is attested as a title of the Earth-goddess. Rejecting sundry attempts to make the command and its alleged fulfilment fit each other, Lendle comes to the conclusion (p. 55), after careful analysis of the whole passage, part by part, 'daß die Verse 70-82 nicht von Hesiod selbst, sondern von einem Interpolator stammen'. He makes out a very plausible case, but does not notice that he has but shifted the misfit from Hesiod to some unknown rhapsode. Why did the supposed interpolator attach his additional verses (the scene of the dressing, adorning, and so forth, of Pandora) so clumsily to the original text? Again, why did the fraud meet with so much success that, as he abundantly proves from vase-paintings, the name Pandora, applied to the clay woman only here in Hesiod, clung to her ever after, so much so that in representations of the earth-goddess appearing from the soil we find Epimetheus standing by ready to receive the treacherous gift of Zeus? If the lines 70-82 are indeed spurious, I would suggest that the interpolator slightly altered the genuine line 83, which as we have it ends in *ἐξέρχουσιν*, 'he (Hermes) completed (his share of) the work'. If it really ought to follow immediately upon 69, the verb should rather be in the plural, 'when they (the various gods and goddesses) had completed', etc.

After an attempt (pp. 58 ff.) to date the supposed interpolation (he comes to the somewhat tentative conclusion that it is not earlier than the first half of the sixth century, p. 60), Lendle sets out to interpret the relevant vase-paintings, especially the Oxford krater (*A.V.P.* 696, No. 22 Beazley; originally published in *J.H.S.* xxi, Plate 1). His general result has already been mentioned; it must be added that he grapples honestly with the many difficulties and criticizes the suggestions of his predecessors with clarity and good sense. His last and in some ways most interesting section (pp. 84-112) deals with the fundamental problem of what Hesiod meant by it all.

His thesis (p. 92) is that the whole story is the poet's invention, the fruit of his deep-seated misogyny, in turn perhaps the result of some unfortunate personal experience. Told first in the *Theogony* (570 ff.), where Epimetheus does not appear (Lendle holds the mention of him in *Theog.* 511-14 to be spurious, pp. 84 ff.), it is repeated with passionate energy in the more personal *Works*. I cannot agree, for the whole narrative seems to me to bear too obviously the marks of a genuine folk-tale. That Hesiod adapted it to his own purposes is, however, likely enough. There is no space here to discuss the original nature of Prometheus (the Greek equivalent of the Trickster of various popular mythologies), but that he should have a stupid brother with nothing divine

about him is not surprising. The section, and the text of the monograph proper, the rest being appendixes and an index, concludes with a discussion of the notorious *πίθος* which contained all the woes of humanity. Lendle is enlightening on the question of what 'Εἰρίς was doing in the jar. She is (pp. 108-9) that idle 'hope' in which the lazy man indulges when he should be working honestly for his living, *W.D.* 498. She is under our control, for we need not so indulge, and that is why she does not fly free like the diseases and cares, which beset mankind ἀνθρώποι, *W.D.* 105.

On p. 50, n. 1, a slip of pen or press has given *πίρ* a masculine adjective. On p. 61, Lendle speaks as if we had the original work of Palaiphatos. But generally, errors of such kinds are absent and the book neatly and correctly printed.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

## SOPHOCLEA

BERNARD M. W. KNOX: *Oedipus at Thebes*. Pp. viii + 280. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 35s. net.

GEORGES MÉAUTIS: *Sophocle. Essai sur le Héros Tragique*. Pp. 291. Paris: Albin Michel, 1957. Paper, 825 fr.

THESE two books on Sophocles have little in common except that both are of more than ordinary interest.

*ὕβρις φρενέει τύραννον*: no one has ever given a satisfying explanation of the first part of this second *stasimon* of the *O.T.*, of which the end, the appeal to Heaven to save the credit of religion by vindicating Apollo's oracles, is so obviously relevant and important. Professor Knox's solution will probably not satisfy many, but in the course of his examination of the problem he brings to bear methods of analysis of words and images which are more familiar in the study of English than of classical literature, and the results are full of interest even for those whom they do not convince.

Knox thinks that Oedipus is the tyrant because he symbolizes the tyrant city, Athens. If we make the assumption that the audience went to the theatre on the look-out for symbolisms of this sort, then much of Knox's theory hangs together tolerably well. But is there any reason to suppose that the audience was on the look-out for this kind of thing? Probably not; but it must be allowed that we lack positive evidence on this point. Further, it is a feature, for good or ill, of this method of inquiry that the investigator always has a second string to his bow. The symbolism 'whether consciously recognised or not' (p. 99) may have affected the feelings of the audience for Oedipus. It is certainly true that the processes of literary appreciation are not entirely conscious, but it remains an unfortunate fact that where no suggestion can ever be proved to be wrong we can feel only limited confidence that any are right.

That the Athenians thought of Athens as a 'tyrant city' is, on the evidence of Thucydides, at least possible. But was there anything in Oedipus, at any rate until the play was well under way, to suggest that he was a tyrant? Knox freely admits that *Tyrannus* was not part of the ancient title, and that the king's character was in most respects the opposite of tyrannical. But he claims that

the word *τύραννος*, though in verse often synonymous with *βασιλεύς*, retains a nuance which would not be lost on the audience; that it is no accident that *βασιλεύς* is used twice only, at 257 of Laius the legitimate king, and at 1202 *βασιλεύς καλῇ*, when Oedipus the adventurer has been revealed as son of Laius and the emphasis is on *καλῇ*. This will not really do. The essential characteristic of a tyrant was that he seized power by violence, not that he had no hereditary claim. If there had been any force in this distinction the Messenger from Corinth would clearly have said *βασιλεύς* at 939, seeing that the Corinthians were making Oedipus king in the belief that he was the son of Polybus. If legitimacy could be thus indicated, he would have wished to indicate it. Further links between Oedipus and Thebes on the one hand and Athens on the other are the plague, the abundance of legal metaphors reflecting the litigious tendencies of Athenians, and the opportunism, which had made Athens leader of the Delian Confederacy, and Oedipus of Thebes. It seems negligent of Knox not to have added that Athens owed her position to the triumph over Persia, Oedipus to his conquest of that eminently Oriental creature, the Sphinx. Again, the image of the ship at 23, inappropriate to inland Thebes, would help to suggest Athens.

Once we regard the correspondence between Oedipus and Athens as established it becomes possible to attribute to Oedipus characteristics which belong primarily to Athens. The self-confident spirit of the Athenians in the period to which the *O. T.* belongs is reflected in the intellectual pride of Oedipus, which hovers on the brink of *ὕβρις*. With this is associated the kind of humanism which is described, and by implication rebuked, in the first *stasimon* of the *Antigone*, where the inventions on which civilized life depends are attributed not to the grace of the gods but to man's ingenuity. Oedipus too is presented in metaphor as helmsman, ploughman, and hunter. He is like the fifth-century rationalist who thinks to account for human society without using the hypothesis of divine origins, and is confident of the limitless prospects of rational inquiry directed to the comprehension of the universe. It is not clear how far a direct allusion to the chorus of the *Antigone* is intended. But the same impression is conveyed to the audience by the repeated use of words 'that typify the scientific spirit' (p. 117). Such words are *ζητεῖν*, *ἰστροπεῖν*, *σκοπεῖν*, *εὐρεῖν*, all associated with the activities of sophistic humanists. Particular attention is given to terms derived from medicine and mathematics in the speech of Oedipus. The end of 'the intellectual progress of Oedipus and Jocasta, which parallels the intellectual progress of the age of enlightenment' (p. 181), is shown in the scepticism about oracles, and consequently about the whole conception of the divinely ordered world, which is censured by the Chorus in the second *stasimon*.

A summary must be far from doing justice to the ingenuity and resource with which Knox defends his theory. Before criticizing the method in detail I mention two objections to the conclusion. First, is not the scepticism of Oedipus, as opposed to Jocasta, overdone? He directed his whole life on the assumption that Apollo's oracle was valid. Even when the evidence that Jocasta's doubts were justified seemed irresistible he still refused to go to Corinth for fear the prophecy should be fulfilled. We are not entitled to regard him as a sort of heroic Protagoras on the strength of a single short speech (964-72); even that contains a pious reservation which Protagoras would have thought unworthy. Nor is it reasonable to say that Oedipus like Mycerinus 'tried to prove the oracle a liar' (p. 43), because he did not go back to Corinth



and kill Polybus. Second, an awkward consequence of all the emphasis on his fearless intellectual energy is that it suggests that the real issue of the play is whether he was right to pursue his investigation into the murder of Laius in the face of Teiresias' warning. 'Both (Oedipus and Athens) come to disaster through the valiant exercise of the very qualities which made them great.' Indeed Knox appears to think that down to the beginning of the *exodos* the conclusion is that 'man should not seek, for fear of what he will find' (p. 185). Was he to wait till his city was ἐρήμος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω?

There is a more fundamental objection. To us looking back it may appear that ruthless energy and intellectual pride were features of Athenian life at this time. But on closer examination the picture loses its unity. The energy of which the Corinthian ambassadors complained to the Spartans was not an intellectual energy; the *demos* and many of its leaders were as credulous as ever Sophocles could have wished. Pericles' sceptical friends were, many of them, foreigners, politically moderate or inclined to oligarchy, rarely imperialists. Again we do not know that a medical metaphor on the lips of Oedipus suggested the 'enlightenment' any more than on the lips of Aeschylus' Agamemnon. We do not know whether the harping on *ἥσος*, if it did put the Athenians in mind of mathematics, would put them in mind more of Hippias and Meton than of Pythagoreans. At any rate the no less persistent use of *ἥσος* in the *Phoenissae* has no flavour of sophistry. In this connexion Knox's own harping on the word 'equation' with its scientific overtones is tendentious. In fact, although the Athenians were nothing if not self-confident, the self-confidence of Oedipus has very little to do with the faults and failings of Athenian democracy.

Because as yet there was little technical jargon and few specialist words were available, common words had a wide range of duty. No doubt they had in some contexts further connotations. Knox is surprisingly confident in some of his assertions about this, and makes little effort to give them statistical support. The words mentioned above may at times have had a scientific flavour, but they had not always, and we can rarely tell when they had. To give an example of Knox's unexact standards, he says that εἰκῆ, in εἰκῆ κράτιστον ζῆν (979), has medical associations. This is supported only by one certain example εἰκῆ . . . βεβυκόρες (*Epid.* i. 19). Now it could be that this was a regular doctor's word. It is the obvious word for life not lived according to a strict regimen; cf. *Reg.* iii. 69. But it need no more be medical than at Eur. *El.* 379, and in default of positive evidence no one is likely to believe that it is.

Finally, I mention some statements which are questionable or, for a study of this nature, imprecise. Oedipus' anger is not 'a force that nothing can arrest' (p. 27); it is arrested by Jocasta and the Chorus. At 766 Jocasta does not go so far as 'to advise Oedipus not to send for the shepherd'. On p. 47 a reader who knew no better would be led to suppose that Laius was warned that his son, if he had one, would not only kill his father but also make an incestuous marriage. There is no reason to think that Jocasta shows religious insensibility at 919 in going to the nearest altar (p. 176), or indeed that there is anything 'formal and shallow' about Oedipus' piety in the prologue (p. 43). And Oedipus never says that 'no trace of the criminal can possibly be found' (p. 81). Nor does he proceed at 399 from an attack on Teiresias to an attack on prophecy in general; Teiresias is the main object throughout (p. 170). And important though it may be to emphasize that this is not wholly a play of destiny,

there is no need to reject Brunck's emendation at 376, since Teiresias knows that the worst of the catastrophe has already taken place.

This is a most stimulating book which contains many truths tellingly put; and the final chapter on Oedipus' tragedy is admirable. But ultimately its value depends on the value of the method. It is a question how far a method which yields answers often most hazardous when applied to periods of English literature which are far better documented can usefully be employed where we know so little.

M. Méautis's book is on more conventional lines. He sometimes discovers the *mot-clef*, but he makes no call on the subconscious. Much of what he says about the plays is naturally common ground, but he knows what he thinks and puts it with force, clarity, and elegance. His interpretation has a frankly Christian slant, and his distaste for *historicism* is undisguised. By detaching himself from the historical background he attains certain advantages, but the unity of his exposition is sometimes achieved at the expense of accuracy. Mythology is treated as a contemporaneous whole; Electra still has a sister Iphianassa, and Chrysippus lurks behind the *Electra* and the *O.T.* The three Theban plays are treated as parts of a single composition, and the characters preserve continuity. Writing of the character of Antigone in the *O.C.* Méautis paradoxically observes that Sophocles 'la précisera, l'approfondira dans l'*Antigone*'.

In his accounts of the plays Méautis seems at times to draw on private sources of information and occasionally to have a confused recollection of the text. How does he know that Creon was disappointed in his hopes of the throne of Thebes by the arrival of Oedipus (p. 130), that Oedipus changed his sentence on Creon from death to exile (p. 116), that Lichas disobeyed Heracles when he revealed the truth about Iole, and that Heracles intended 'répudier' Deianira after his marriage with Iole? (pp. 262, 264). *O.C.* 987 means that Oedipus did not intentionally marry his mother, not 'Thébes l'a contraint à épouser Jocaste' (p. 159). It is perverse to argue that *κηλὶς* at *O.C.* 1134 does not imply impurity and the danger of contamination, and there is no reason to infer from 1632 that Theseus gives Oedipus his hand (pp. 160, 169). It was not courage that Electra had lacked, *El.* 1023, but comprehension (p. 231). In general, Méautis makes a little too much of love in the case of Antigone, and not enough of loyalty; in the case of Electra too much of hate, not enough of her passion for justice.

But these are details. Méautis's main theme is an important one, the heroic element in Sophocles, the quality, in part a capacity for suffering, which sets his heroes apart from ordinary men. He brings out well the difference between the abject Creon of the end of the *Antigone* and real heroes. It is an interesting suggestion that Tecmessa fails Ajax because she cannot meet him, as an Antigone could have done, on his own level, and it is well said that Philoctetes is an Ajax who is saved because his Teucer comes in time. In each play the same pattern is discovered. A hero who is isolated from his fellow creatures, or most of them, in virtue of heroic qualities passes through a 'nuit profonde' of suffering and desolation which has some analogy with the darkness of Calvary. But passing through implies emergence; this emergence is dependent on the tacit assumption that to be heroic involves being a hero in the technical sense of possessing a cult, and on the further assumption that the hero in his grave, Oedipus for instance awaiting his draught of hot Theban blood, is in some sense in a state

of blessedness. *Ant.* 897 ff. is read as a passionate affirmation of faith in immortality (p. 225). We encounter also the unfamiliar category of Olympian hero. But the biggest assumption of all is that from the 'nuit profonde' of Sophocles there was any emergence at all. To me Knox's final words on Oedipus seem nearer the mark: 'Man at his greatest, as in Oedipus, is capable of something which the gods, by definition, cannot experience; the proud tragic view of Sophocles sees in the fragility and inevitable defeat of human greatness the possibility of a purely human heroism to which the gods can never attain, for the condition of their existence is everlasting victory.'

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

## ARISTOTLE: *DE PARTIBUS ANIMALIUM*

PIERRE LOUIS: Aristote, *Les Parties des Animaux*. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xl+193 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1956. Paper.

M. LOUIS has produced a sound, conservative edition of the *de Partibus Animalium* (*P.A.*), containing little that is new but making good use of earlier work.

In the introduction he gives a brief account of the reasons for thinking that *P.A.* is a genuine work of Aristotle, containing sections written at various times but put together by the author himself, and serving as the introduction to both a longer and a shorter series of biological studies. M. Louis inclines to the view that the book does not consist simply of lecture notes, but was revised for publication. On the chronological question, he accepts M. Nuyens's conclusion that *P.A.* 2-4 belongs to the middle period of the development of Aristotle's psychology, though *P.A.* 1 is later than this. M. Louis adds that *P.A.* 2-4 is itself not homogeneous, since it shows traces of divergent views on the faculty of touch. This chronology is quite likely, but one ought perhaps to repeat a warning against resting too heavily on this line of argument. M. Nuyens's criterion (the development of Aristotle's thought from a two-substance, Platonic, theory of *ψυχή* to the *ἐντελέχεια* theory explained in the *de Anima*) is useful, but it is only *one* criterion, and it is always vulnerable to the objection that Aristotle's *obiter dicta* are often carelessly phrased.

About the text of *P.A.* there are two schools of thought. The first, represented most strongly by Professor I. Düring's book on *P.A.* (Gothenburg, 1943), is that the manuscript tradition is pretty good; if the text contains difficulties, it is because of the subject-matter and style. 'If ever a conservative criticism of the text is well-grounded,' writes Professor Düring, 'it is in a text of this kind, where the central thing is the subject-matter, and language and style are comparable to the language a modern scholar uses in his notes and rough drafts for a lecture.' The second school of thought, represented by Dr. A. L. Peck's Loeb edition (1937), is much more suspicious of the manuscripts and prepared to make radical revisions in the interests of consistency.

M. Louis belongs to the first school. His text is the vulgate, somewhat modified by Düring. He takes the same view of the manuscripts as Düring, particularly with regard to Y (*Vaticanus gr.* 261), which Peck tends to follow but Düring rejects as the work of an 'officious copyist'. (M. Louis has himself

collated *Parisinus gr.* 1863 (Σ) and apparently also *Parisinus gr.* 1864 (Π) and *Parisinus suppl.* gr. 333 (Δ), but they have contributed virtually nothing to his text.)

Perhaps an example will illustrate the differences between the editors most effectively.

692<sup>a</sup>20: *λοχρότατος δ' ὁ χαμαιλέον τῶν φωτόκων καὶ πεζῶν ἐστὶ πάντων ἀλγαιμότατος γὰρ ἐστίν. αἴτιον δὲ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἥθος ἐστίν αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ τὸν φόβον γίγνεται πολύμορφος. κατὰ φύσιν γὰρ ὁ φόβος δι' ἀλγαιμίας καὶ δι' ἔνδειαν ἐστὶ θερμότητος.*

Y alters the wording considerably but not the sense:

*ὁ δὲ χαμαιλέον τῶν φωτόκων καὶ πεζῶν ἀλγοσαρκότατος ἐστίν διὰ τὸ ἀλγαιμότατος εἶναι. τούτου δ' αἴτιον τὸ ἥθος τοῦ ζώου τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς· πολύμορφον γὰρ γίνεται διὰ τὸν φόβον, ὁ δὲ φόβος κατὰ φύσιν δι' ἀλγαιμότητά ἐστι καὶ ἔνδειαν θερμότητος.*

Peck follows Y in general. But he believes (as Thurot did) that the text *ought* to say that the chameleon is timorous because he has so little blood in him, not bloodless because timorous; and he refers to 667<sup>a</sup>11 ff., where Aristotle says αἱ δὲ διαφοραὶ τῆς καρδίας . . . τείνουσι πῃ καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἦθη, as well as to 650<sup>b</sup>27 δειλότερα δὲ τὰ λίαν ὑδατώδη. So he emends the second sentence to read ταῦτ' ὁ δ' αἴτιον τοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἥθους ἐστὶ τοῦ ζώου with a note 'sed fortasse haec verba secludenda'. Düring rejects Y's reading (except its omission of δι' before ἔνδειαν, because in this Y agrees with S) on the general ground that Y is a fussy attempt to add polish to Aristotle's rough but effective word-order. He rejects Thurot's suggestions (and so by implication Peck's) with some convincing evidence to show that Aristotle *might* have written what the scribes thought he wrote (chameleons bloodless because timorous), so that we have no right to alter the text. M. Louis follows Düring (except in his omission of δι'). In this passage, and in many others where earlier editors differ (see for instance 654<sup>b</sup>16-25, 656<sup>b</sup>20-22, 659<sup>b</sup>4, 661<sup>a</sup>4, 684<sup>b</sup>21-685<sup>a</sup>11), he shows perfectly sound judgement in choosing between alternatives.

To turn briefly to some more questionable decisions: Aristotle explains in the first chapter that the natural scientist must study *ψυχή* but not the whole of *ψυχή*; otherwise natural science would include the study of νοῦς and νοητά, and would then be all-embracing. The text continues (641<sup>b</sup>10): *ἐτι δὲ τῶν ἐξ ἀφαιρέσεως οὐδενὸς ὅλον τ' εἶναι τὴν φυσικὴν θεωρητικὴν, ἐπειδὴ ἡ φύσις ἐνεκά του ποιεῖ πάντα. φαίνεται γὰρ . . .* and goes on to discuss purposiveness in nature. It is very difficult to account for the mention here of τὰ ἐξ ἀφαιρέσεως, the objects of mathematics, and Düring rejects *ἐτι . . . θεωρητικὴν* as a marginal note, emending *ἐπειδὴ ἡ* to *ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ* and repunctuating the rest. His reason for this change is that the purposiveness of nature cannot be the reason for excluding mathematics from natural science. But as a matter of fact it could be, as M. Louis says in his note (he might have referred to *Met.* 996<sup>a</sup>27 ff.). So M. Louis keeps the vulgate text. But the real objection to the sentence about mathematics is that it is so oddly placed at the beginning of a section on a new subject, though logically it belongs to the previous topic; for it seems to give another bit of evidence to show that natural science does not deal with all νοητά. In my view Düring is right, but not quite for the right reasons. The connexion between mathematics and the final cause (and the odd syntax of *ἐπεὶ δὲ κατλ.*, excellently explained by Düring) made it plausible for some scribe or editor to put the note in here.

640<sup>a</sup>15-17. *μᾶλλον* governs *ἦ*; M. Louis mistranslates.

640<sup>a</sup>33. One sentence is untranslated.



641<sup>b</sup>31. τὸ οὐδὲ τὸ σπέρμα] not, I think, 'l'être d'où vient le germe' but 'what it is a seed of', i.e. the adult that will grow from it.

642<sup>b</sup>5. τὸ καθ' ἑκαστον] εἶδος surely, not 'le particulier'.

647<sup>b</sup>12. ἕως ἂν ἐν τῇ φύσει] not 'dans le mesure qu'exige la nature' but 'as long as it is in a natural state'. Similarly at 649<sup>b</sup>28 ἐν τῇ φύσει and χωριζόμενα δ' ἐκ τῆς φύσεως τῶν ἐχόντων mean 'in the living organism' and 'separated from the living parent body'.

647<sup>b</sup>19. ἔστι γὰρ ὡς ἐνίαν τὸ μέρος δμῶνυμιον τῷ ὅλῳ, ἔστι δ' ὡς οὐχ δμῶνυμιον, οἷον φλεβὸς φλέψ, ἀλλὰ προσώπου προσώπων οὐδαμῶς.] The words οἷον φλεβὸς φλέψ were transferred here by Düring (in the manuscripts they follow τῷ ὅλῳ), and there are supposed to be three classes, of which blood-vessels illustrate the second and faces the third. But there are only two classes here: (1) ἔστι γὰρ ὡς . . . , ἔστι δ' ὡς οὐ . . . , (2) . . . , οὐδαμῶς. So there is no reason to transfer οἷον φλεβὸς φλέψ. As Ogle says (Oxford Translation, ad loc.) both are vascular tissue (ἔστι γὰρ ὡς . . . ), but a bit of blood-vessel is not a blood-vessel (ἔστι δ' ὡς οὐ . . . ).

649<sup>b</sup>27. ἡ δὲ κατὰ πάθος τὸ αἷμα, οὐ καθ' αὐτὸ θερμόν.] M. Louis ignores the adversative δὲ and fails to translate ἡ.

652<sup>b</sup>32. The text has πολλοῦ but the translation obviously implies θολεροῦ, the reading of William of Moerbeke.

666<sup>b</sup>24-31. The translation follows Düring, but the text has not caught up with him.

In sum, this is a useful volume, particularly for the text. M. Louis's notes (at the bottom of the page, overflowing into a supplement) are usually adequate, though they are not as fascinating as Ogle's in the Oxford Translation.

University College, London

D. J. FURLEY

## ARISTOPHANIC STUDIES

HANS-JOACHIM NEWIGER: *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes*. (Zetemata, Heft 16.) Pp. xiv+185. Munich: Beck, 1957. Paper, DM. 18.

FEW people have been so ingenious, or so rash, as to find ἀλληγορία in Aristophanes. On the other hand, if 'allegory' is used, as it has commonly been used since the eighteenth century, to mean simply the personification of qualities, acts, and situations, Aristophanes is pre-eminently an allegorical dramatist. Newiger adopts Hegel's definition of 'allegory', the representation of an abstraction by a person in such a way as to invest the person only with the attributes of the abstraction, denying him all individuality. In this sense of the word, Penia and Plutos are the most allegorical of Aristophanic characters, the Logoi of *Nub.* being nearest to them among the rest; Demos in *Eq.* and the choruses of *Vesp.* and *Nub.* are not allegorical, nor are Spondai, Opora, Diallage, etc. Personification is essentially 'metaphor taken literally', the transposition of metaphorical speech into visible action. In *Ach.* 978-99 the chorus vividly describe Polemos as an aggressive κωμαστής and yearn for marriage with Diallage; in *Ran.* 939 ff. Euripides describes his therapeutic treatment of Techne; in Polemos and Opora of *Pax* and Diallage of *Lys.* the verbal images of *Ach.* are given flesh and blood. Language and action

appropriate to the metaphorical treatment of the subject are continuously interwoven with what is appropriate to its literal treatment (e.g. *Eq.* 884-6), as Newiger shows by detailed interpretation of *Eq.* (pp. 11-49) and parts of *Nub.* (pp. 50-73).

His analysis of *Eq.* is an interesting and perceptive demonstration of how Aristophanic dramaturgy actually works, and we need not always agree with his use of the terms 'metaphor', 'symbol', and 'allegory' in order to recognize the thoroughness and clarity with which he shows how one personification differs from another. He has an uncommonly mature grasp of the nature of comedy, and on a multitude of questions he preserves an unshakably sensible judgement as he steers between the extravagances of his elders.

On one matter of principle and several of detail his interpretation is open to doubt. The Greeks habitually speak of things in terms which we reserve for persons. Cult and the visual arts show that this is more than a purely linguistic phenomenon, but language illustrates it most vividly by treating the same word in the same sentence as thing and as person. Newiger is right to defend the originality of Aristophanes' *καὶ αὖτ' ἰδέαι* against Immermann's suggestion that they are no more than artistic elaborations of metaphors, similes, and sayings current in popular speech; at the same time, he makes an interesting collection (e.g. p. 142: *Logoi of Nub.* ~ *Nomoi of Pl. Crito*) of personifications in other authors; and yet one cannot feel satisfied that he appreciates the relation between Aristophanic personification and Greek modes of thought in general. He is too much inclined to derive Aristophanic passages from specific sources in the meagre remnants of fifth-century literature. In discussing the agon of the *Logoi* in *Nub.* he refers much of its content to Protagoras, and derives its form from Prodicus' \**Ωραι*, suggesting that *λόγος* is meant to remind us of Protagoras' nickname (*E Pl. Rep.* 600 c), *ἀντιλέγειν*, etc., of his *Ἀντιλογοίαι*, and metaphors from wrestling (901, 1047), of his *καταβάλλοντες*. Wrestling is one of the commonest sources of Greek metaphor, and after what Newiger says of its use in *Eq.* (pp. 25-27) it is surprising to be told that Eur. *I.A.* 1013 'erinnert an Protagoras' (p. 143). He makes Prodicus' \**Ωραι* responsible for the reference to Herakles in *Nub.* 1045 (this, and much more, is suggested also by Cataudella in *Studi offerti a Emmanuele Ciceri*, pp. 41-62) and the ancestor of Penia in *Pl.* Such hypotheses overrate the artistic originality of the Sophists, who spoke in the terms with which centuries of poetry had familiarized their audiences.

Newiger rightly perceives that we cannot speak of *Βασίλειᾶ* (*Av.* 1537, 1753) 'Queen' as if she personified *βασιλεία*, 'sovereignty', but he misses the most important single fact about her. His question 'Who is Basileia?', by which he seems to mean 'To what goddess, known to us by other names, does Aristophanes here give the name Basileia?', is also asked by Peithetairos (1537), and Peithetairos' meaning is different. He has never heard of Basileia, and Prometheus enlightens him on the organization of Zeus's household. Basileia is the housekeeper, but—unlike Eurykleia and, no doubt, most Greek housekeepers—*καλλίστη κόρη*, as one might expect in a well-appointed Greek heaven. By marrying the *ταμῖα* (complimented as *πάρεδρος Διὸς* in the marriage-song, 1753) Peithetairos acquires the *ταμιεύμενα* (1538-43 ~ 1642-5); and if we ask why Zeus could not appoint a new housekeeper and retain his property, we must remember that to the Greek divine persons differ from humans in being inseparable from their functions; this is one aspect of a mode of thought

of which Plutos exemplifies another aspect, and to that extent alone Basileia is 'abstract'.

In discussing the chorus of *Nub.* Newiger explains too much too easily. *Meréwpos* is a metaphorical description of scientific, philosophical, and artistic speculation, and the clouds represent the 'metaphor taken literally'; here Newiger reaches substantial agreement with Erbse, *Hermes*, lxxxii (1954), 385-420; but he goes on to make it—not find it—a description also of dishonest rhetoric, which is 'unstable' because it rests on 'a questionable moral foundation'. The connexion, however, between natural history and rhetoric does not lie in any community of attributes but in the fact that anyone who scratches below the surface of things is bound to sustain arguments which the plain man regards as τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν, and in the historical accidents which brought about a precocious development of intellectual speculation in the particular political circumstances of the fifth century.

Some minor points: p. 14, n. 1: the explanation of the name 'Lysistrate' becomes apparent in *Lys.* 48 ff., long before 554. P. 42: *Nub.* 267 is a much simpler type of joke than *Eq.* 1028-9. Pp. 52, 54: in *Nub.* 201 ff. the scientific objects are hardly 'symbolic', and have nothing in common with the wine of *Ach.* 186 ff. or the scales of *Ran.* 1365 ff. P. 80: if the stings of the wasp-chorus are simply the phalloi, comic opportunities are lost, and surely the joke of *Vesp.* 431 lies not in indecency but in the simple humour of other people's pain (cf. the British Museum vase B 177)? P. 90: *Σ* on *Av.* 1411 is honest, and shows how tenuous is the connexion with Simon. 46 D<sup>2</sup>. P. 98: in *Av.* 1753 διὰ σέ, references to metaphors in other authors do not suffice to make σέ (thunder and lightning) an allusion to Peithetairos's persuasive tongue; the translation 'having attained supremacy by virtue of thunder and lightning, he also possesses (as wife) Basileia' does not conflict with the fact that Peithetairos possesses thunder and lightning by virtue of his possession of Basileia. P. 126: modern German idioms do nothing to prove that the scene *Ach.* 926 ff. is a 'metaphor taken literally'. P. 139: if *Σ Nub.* 88g is an inference from the text, it is unique; *Hyp. Aesch. Ag.* is no parallel, in view of *Σ Eur. Or.* 57. P. 144: Wilamowitz's interpretation of *Hyp. VII Nub.* is not at all surprising; it is simply that he knew better than Newiger what ἀμείβεω means and how the writer would have expressed himself if he meant what Newiger thinks he meant.

One important omission from the bibliography is Ilse Meckenstock, *Naturbild und Tierchor bei Aristophanes*, Diss. Marburg, 1952; it is not printed, but neither is Koch, *Wesen und Struktur des komischen Themas*, to which Newiger several times refers, and much of it is highly relevant to his subject.

University of St. Andrews

K. J. DOVER

## FRAGMENTS OF ATTIC COMEDY

J. M. EDMONDS: *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*. Vol. i: *Old Comedy*. Pp. 1028. Leyden: Brill, 1957. Cloth, fl. 98.

THIS work is intended for a wider audience than is usual with editions of fragments: Edmonds has aimed at making the Comic fragments 'intelligible to the reader who knows little or no Greek' as well as meeting the needs of the scholar, and so has translated fragments and testimonia in full. The reviewer thus has to consider the book from the viewpoint of two classes of reader.

The scholar will welcome an edition of the Comic fragments incorporating in a single work the new material provided by a period rich in discoveries and the fragments already known to Kock. He will also be relieved to find that Kock's numbering has been followed where possible, and that differences between Edmonds's numbering and Kock's are conveniently noted in the text as they occur. Very full testimonia on each poet (except Aristophanes) are given at the head of his fragments, including the relevant excerpts from the dramatic inscriptions and the lexicographers, as well as passages from all the critics, together with allusions from Greek and Latin literature.

But the provision of this material and of the translation has made it necessary to keep notes down to a minimum to save space, with the result that the text has no real apparatus criticus, and there is no systematic explanatory commentary. To consider the notes to the text first: variants in the ancient sources of a fragment are recorded (though not always completely, cf. the 'Susarion' fragment), but there is no systematic attempt to set forth the work of modern scholarship. The names of emenders are regularly suppressed, and only rarely are alternative suggestions given, a procedure which is particularly misleading in the papyrus fragments and very corrupt passages. Nor has the best use always been made of the available space: many trivial variants (e.g. οὐτω for οὕτως Eupolis fr. 111 = 91 K) are recorded and some of the critical notes are unnecessarily wordy.

The text itself is marred by inaccuracies over and above those minor misprints which the reader instantaneously corrects: e.g. Vitruvius vi *pref.* (p. 132) (Chionides fr. 9) for *versari* read *gubernari*; Ar. *Eq.* 530 (Cratinus testimonia) for ἡρθησαν ἐκεῖνοι read ἡρθησαν ἐκεῖνος; Pherecr. fr. 145 l. 6 δῶμος is omitted before οἶτος. Inaccuracies which the reader will correct more easily include Ar. *Vesp.* 1027 (Eupolis testimonia) for ἔχειν read ἔχων; Lucian, *Bis Acc.* 33 (ibidem) for χλευάσας read χλευάσαι; Ar. fr. 81 for δῶρ' read δῶρ'.

That this is not a conservative text is soon clear: for instance, in Ecphantides fr. 2 Edmonds reads Μεγαρικῆς κωμωδίας | ἄμει διείμαι, deleting as glosses the rest of what Aspasius gives as part of the quotation. This is ingenious, but the vocabulary is unusual: ἄω appears to be solely Epic and διείμαι in the sense required is not found (in Alexis fr. 188, to which Edmonds refers, διειμένον ὀξεῖ means 'mixed' with vinegar, literally, which scarcely justifies διείμαι 'I am soaked in'). Among other audacities in style and vocabulary may be mentioned Cratinus fr. 162 (*Pluti*) l. 5 ὀρκουμαι = 'swear' (in classical Greek it is found only in the active, meaning 'bind someone by oath'), id. fr. 162 a l. 3 ἀποφανόμενον 'seeming', Eupolis fr. 122 b (*Demes*, Aristides-scene) l. 17 εἰ . . . ἀποκλείεις ἐκποδῶν 'excluding' 'not to mention'. At Pherecrates fr. 51 he proposes <πρι>φέρεται (τέρεται Kock), which he says 'probably means here "to fidget"' but the parallels from Plutarch seem scarcely adequate. Yet on the same fragment he is sensitive enough to niceties of Attic to denounce ἀποκριθῶ, though one may not agree that the meaning 'answer' is unsuitable here: it seems to make a good antithesis to σιωπῶ. He conjectures (but does not print) ἀναμύσω for ἀποκριθῶ: perhaps we might read ὑπολάβω (Phot., Suid., etc., from the *Συναγωγή*, v. ὑπολαβῶν give ἀποκριθεῖς among other glosses). There are similar licences in prosody and metre, e.g. prodelision of a in ἀν (Eupolis fr. 103 = 117 K l. 7) and ἀγανακτήσονταις (Cratinus, fr. 162 l. 3), a spondee as the seventh foot of an anapaestic tetrameter catalectic (Pherecr., fr. 23, l. 3). Occasionally an emendation corrupts a sound text, e.g. Σ Ar. *Eq.*



400 (Cratinus testimonia) . . . διαβάλλει τὸν Κρατῖνον. ὅπερ μοι δοκεῖ παροξυνθεὶς ἐκείνος . . . γράφει δρᾶμα τὴν Πυτίνην means 'I think that Cratinus wrote the *Pytine* in anger at this slander.' Edmonds inserts ὅτι after παροξυνθεὶς which makes the scholiast guilty of a chronological error of which he (unlike his colleague at *Eq.* 526) is innocent, besides creating a difficulty with ὅπερ. In the Phercrateas testimonia (Anon., περὶ κωμ. c. 8) Edmonds reads <Κράτῃτα ἄρχοντα> νικᾷ ἐπὶ θεάτρων, γενόμενος ὑποκριτῆς <καὶ αὐτὸς> ἐξήλωκας, καὶ αὐτοῦ μὲν λουδορεῖν ἀπέστη, κτλ. identifying Crates the comic poet with the archon of 434-3. Dobree's ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου seems preferable: we can easily supply <ἄρχοντος> after Θεοδώρου: it could have fallen out once Θεοδώρου had been corrupted, or by homoeoteleuton before γενόμενος. We could go on γενόμενος δὲ ὑποκριτῆς ἐξήλωκε Κράτῃτα (so the tradition), καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ μὲν κτλ. But there are many happy ideas too (e.g. the deletion of Περικλέης in Cratinus, fr. 71) and throughout Edmonds shows himself keenly aware of the processes of textual corruption.

On the 'Demes' papyri Edmonds has used panchromatic and infra-red photographs, and interesting new readings have been brought to light: e.g. Harmodius, not Aristides, as the first speaker after the parabasis. But although the camera can see farther than the eye, the text still depends on the editor's report of what his eye sees in the photographs: and many may feel, without in any way disparaging the camera, that Edmonds's standards of doubtfulness and certainty differ from those of most other papyrologists, and he rarely notes a reading as doubtful. One would hesitate to attribute this degree of certainty to the camera: superior photographs, one might expect, would lead an editor to promote some readings from doubtful to certain, and to give doubtful readings in places formerly illegible, without greatly affecting the total number of letters marked as doubtful. In the 'Demes' papyrus he reports definite readings in places where, so far as I can tell from the photographs he published in *Mnemosyne*, viii (1940), the papyrus itself, as distinct from the writing, has not survived. Sometimes the supplement in question seems a certain conjecture, e.g. Eup. fr. 110 b l. 3 ἡσχύν[ε]το, fr. 122 b l. 4 ἀνο[ρά]ν, fr. 122 c l. 15 ἐ[βουλ]όμην, fr. 128 b l. 9 [αὐ]τό[ν], but not always: cf. e.g. fr. 122 b 6 ἡπ[ι]μολών, fr. 122 b 21 τί ἄλλ' ἄ]ν, fr. 122 c 1 [νοσημάτων], fr. 122 c 11 ἐ[στι]ν ὅν, fr. 122 c 21 [Μορμῶ μέλει, fr. 128 a 9 π]ᾶς [ἄρ'] ἡδ[η θυ]μάτων, fr. 128 d l. 10 μαχου[μένους]. But except for points of this kind misreadings are very rare; one is at fr. 122 c 12, where the papyrus has μου not μοι. Once or twice a bracket is misprinted or omitted. In other papyri, too, Edmonds is always bold in admitting restorations to the text: and although he often states in general terms that a restoration is hazardous, the fullness of the text as printed may puzzle the reader given no alternatives.

Pressure on space has also prevented the provision of an adequate commentary. This will not only disappoint the scholar, but also disturb the general reader. He will ask, for instance, how satire on Pericles can have been worked into 'Dionysalexander': he will read contradictory statements in the testimonia, but gets no guidance as to which is to be preferred and why. He is not told how shadowy a figure Susarion is, that the fragment surviving under his name is centuries later than his presumed time, or how unlikely it is that the fragments of Chionides and Magnes are genuine. No note is given in the Eupolis testimonia on the story that the poet was drowned or ducked by Alcibiades in revenge for the 'Baptae': but a note on p. 331 (under 'Baptae') shows that

Edmonds (perhaps surprisingly) accepts the basis of the story, and adopts Tzetzes's alternative suggestion that Eupolis was ducked but not fatally. There are inaccuracies in the explanatory notes, e.g. on Eupolis, fr. 72 Edmonds seems to confuse *ἰνυξ* and *ρόμβος*, though he refers to Gow's article in *J.H.S.* 54 (1934) which ended that confusion. Sometimes notes on a subject are scattered, and difficult to find, e.g. Edmonds says (p. 311 n., 979 n.) that Eupolis was probably killed at Aegospotami, and on p. 979 that he 'cannot have died before Cynossema' but does not refer to his note on p. 327 where he dates the second '*Autolykus*' definitely to 410 on the strength of fr. 43, which he refers to Aristarchus' betrayal of Oenoe. Similarly his arguments for dating the '*Demes*' to 411 are difficult to unearth. A short discussion of the evidence on such questions at the head of each poet or play would have helped the reader.

On some topics Edmonds leaves the reader asking for more: but of the '*Demes*' he gives a complete conjectural reconstruction, in essentials the same as that contained in his article in *Mnemosyne*, viii (1940): nine great men from Athens' past (Nicias, Solon, Peisistratus, Cleisthenes, Miltiades, Harmodius, Aristogeiton, Aristides, and Pericles) are resurrected and appointed Nine Archons: the main theme of the plot was Reconciliation, and its climax the return of Alcibiades. There are some definite improbabilities; e.g. in fr. 111 = 91 K Edmonds tacitly assumes that Aristides' interlocutor is Nicias, whereas in fact the text of Galen, who quotes the fragment, is corrupt here and 'Nicias' an indifferent conjecture: also the gap Edmonds assumes between the first two sheets of the Cairo fragments seems too long. But apart from particular points, a piece of work in which conjecture plays so large a part is scarcely appropriate for a standard edition. Although Edmonds tries to indicate what is conjecture, it becomes very difficult to separate fact from conjecture, using this edition, especially as the text is so hospitable to conjectural restoration: and this makes it doubly unfortunate that shortage of space has apparently excluded not only the systematic mention of alternatives, but also bibliographies.

The translation is conveniently printed opposite the text, on the right-hand pages. The fact that it is in verse raises problems: the exigencies of metre and rhyme inevitably compromise its accuracy, and the fact that the fragments are fragments may well lessen the aesthetic pleasure given by the verse. The translations are often pleasingly neat, though sometimes there are quaintnesses in vocabulary not prompted by anything in the original, and inversions enforced by rhyme, which seem odd today: very occasionally one finds an English word misused, like 'haver' (Pherecr. fr. 19), which means 'talk nonsense', not 'hesitate' or 'dither'. In the passages from Aristophanes in the testimonia Edmonds has to compete with Rogers, and the reader may well feel that Rogers wins, because he keeps closer to both the letter and the spirit of the original: compare e.g. Edmonds' translation of *Ran.* 354 f. 'All tongues must be still for our sacred song, and away from the Presence must flit | Whoever's untaught in our methods of thought or is wanting in pureness of wit' with Rogers's. But Edmonds often recaptures the spirit of his original, e.g. in the famous fragment of the '*Demes*' about Pericles' oratory. It is much to be thankful for nowadays that a verse translation should be recognizable as verse: but for fragments the advantages of a prose translation might well have outweighed the disadvantages.

There is a time-chart of Old Comedy, and indexes of playwrights, plays (Greek and English titles) and a general index.

Much devoted labour and lively original thought has gone into this book; although, however, it contains much matter of the greatest interest, the inaccuracies, omissions, and freedom in conjecture preclude its acceptance as definitive. But it is most challenging and stimulating.<sup>1</sup>

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

## PLATO'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

K. R. POPPER: *The Open Society and its Enemies*. Vol. i: *The Spell of Plato*. Vol. ii: *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*. Pp. xi+322; v+391. London: Routledge, 1957. Cloth, £2. 10s. net.

THIS is the third edition of a work which was first published in 1945. Reviewing the first volume in *C.R.* lxi (1947), 55, the late Professor Hackforth criticized it for certain fundamental misunderstandings of Plato. Those criticisms still stand, together with most of those which have been published by other classical scholars (in particular, the late Professor G. C. Field, *Philosophy*, 1946) who have given careful and sympathetic consideration to Professor Popper's thesis. For this edition modifies nothing, except for a very few small corrections, and some additions to the notes, which do not affect the main picture. (Even the habit of referring to the text by note numbers instead of page numbers persists, though the excuse for it has gone.) Plato still appears as 'a totalitarian party-politician' who wished to revive a 'magic tribalism', with himself as patriarchal king; and his writings are still 'poisonous'. Even when Plato condemns what Popper also dislikes, for example, the lust for power, Popper 'cannot but feel' (p. 155) that Plato is actually 'inspired' by the motives which he condemns. On this level of 'feeling'—the level of physical revulsion—philosophic argument is as futile as the bandying of texts in which some of Popper's critics (notably De Vries) have indulged; no argument can cope with antiperistasis. For Popper, therefore, fair-seeming words from Plato point sometimes to self-deception, but more frequently to a cunning attempt to condition the reader for the acceptance of some impending feudal-fascist perversity; for Plato's standards of intellectual honesty are low indeed.

The second volume explains the purpose of the attack on Plato; it was 'to show the role Plato and Aristotle have played in the rise of historicism' (both when they were understood and when they were not understood—Popper has it both ways) and in the fight against equalitarianism. Thus Aristotle is admitted to be no historicist but is somehow to blame for the Hegelian worship of History as 'the World's Court of Justice'. This seems partly because of his insistence on definitions. It is curious that Socrates, who is one of Popper's favourites in the first volume, escapes all reproof for putting Aristotle on this wrong road. It is perhaps worth remarking that early in the first volume the treatment of Heraclitus provides a miniature model for what comes later: one

<sup>1</sup> The above review was in the press at the time of Mr. Edmonds's death. The tribute to the original and stimulating qualities of the book now becomes an expres-

sion of the gap that has been left—a gap that will be felt and lamented by classical scholars everywhere.

notes the oddity, in the first place, of the translations (fr. 40: 'Much learning teaches not understanding' appears as 'Who knows many things need not have many brains'); secondly, of the interpretation of the text (this fragment is an attack on 'the more empirically minded scientists'); and, thirdly, of the treatment of the historical background (the 'scientists' in question comprise 'Hesiod and Pythagoras and also Xenophanes').

J. TATE

## PLUTARCH'S *LIVES*

Plutarchi *Vitae Parallelae*: recognoverunt Cl. Lindskog et K. Ziegler. Vol. i, fasc. 1 iterum recensuit K. ZIEGLER. Pp. xiv+423. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Cloth, DM. 19.20.

LINDSKOG's text of the *Lives* contained in this volume (*Theseus, Romulus; Solon, Publicola; Themistocles, Camillus; Aristides, Cato Maior; Cimon, Lucullus*) was published in 1914 and is no longer available. Ziegler's revision brings no new manuscript evidence, but few pages are without a place or two in which his decision differs from his predecessor's. These differences are mostly due to greater readiness to emend, combined with a rather greater respect for UMA when they agree against the Seitenstettensis, for which Lindskog had, as Ziegler now thinks, too much regard. A separate discussion of this problem is promised.

The result here is a text with a slightly fuller (still very concise) apparatus, with the merit of forcing on one's attention the usefulness of the way in which Reiske and Corais used to go about Plutarch, questioning the tradition at every point in the light of sense and usage, and being ready to emend—a way which the editor of Plutarch must still, though cautiously, follow. Ziegler's immense experience and skill have made useful gleanings (I single out p. 53, 26 μὴ ἀντὶς εἰσελεῖν) and the numerous suggestions which he makes but does not promote from the apparatus to the text deserve careful attention. This is not to say that there are not some which appear gratuitous—just as there are passages still in need of treatment. The important point is that this is a better edition for a reader of inquiring mind than was Lindskog's.

Of passages still needing change, I select only two. At p. 95, 26 (*Solon*, 12. 11) Ziegler, like Lindskog, retains κελύσαι . . . προειπών, which is surely ungrammatical. Wilamowitz's ἐκέλευσε is one obvious correction: another is προειπόνθ' ὥς. P. 198, 18 ff. (*Camillus* 2. 6): this sentence is lame, and one should read either ὃν δὲ πρόσχημα (cf. Kühner-Gerth, § 369, for attractions of this kind) or πολλοὺς <δέ> καὶ in l. 21.

The number of misprints and small oversights in the volume is considerable. In the Preface and list of *sigla* we find γ as the symbol used for the UMA group: in the apparatus this becomes Υ. There is a similar confusion between S<sup>t</sup> and S<sup>e</sup> (e.g. p. 84, first line of apparatus). Corrections which should be made include the following. P. 13, 26 note: read [μέρος]. P. 16, 26: ἔφθασεν. P. 18, 7: ἀργυροῦν. P. 20, 12: ὥς. P. 68, 7 note: 56, 4. P. 101, 29: fr. 23, 16 d. P. 112, 12: μετοικισμένοις. P. 172, 7: Πέροης (for Ξέρξης). P. 230, 21: τεταρρηκότας. P. 245, 8-9: καταφοράς. P. 305, 21: τοῦ. P. 318, 13: ἀποδιοπομπήσασθαι (for ἀποδια-, a false form taken over from Lindskog).



Cross-references and bibliography are on the same scale as in Lindsay. Holden's useful *Themistocles* (3rd edition 1892) is an obvious omission. In *Cato Maior*, references to Malcovati, *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, would have been useful.

Greek historians will note the reading *εἰς Νέστον* (*Themistocles* 25. 2); Ziegler might well have referred to some recent discussion, e.g. Gomme, *Thucydides*, i. 398-9.

St. John's College, Oxford

D. A. RUSSELL

## A COMMENTARY ON POLYBIUS

F. W. WALBANK: *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Vol. i: Commentary on Books i-vi. Pp. xxvii+776; 13 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 84s. net.

THE publication of the first volume of Walbank's Polybius is an important event in the history of modern scholarship: the last full commentary, that by Johann Schweighäuser, was published at the time of the French Revolution. The emphasis of that commentary was primarily philological, and it receives due praise from Walbank. But since that time much work has been done on the text, especially of the fragmentary books, by Nissen, Hultsch, and Büttner-Wobst; and knowledge of the ancient world, especially of the Hellenistic Age, has certainly not stood still. Clearly therefore a modern commentary on Polybius has long been one of the crying needs of scholarship. The task is formidable and it fortunately appears to have deterred anyone who was not fully competent from attempting it: now at last a scholar admirably suited to the daunting difficulties has addressed himself to the labour, and the result is a work for which all historians will be profoundly grateful and of which British scholarship may justly be proud. Nor should the Press that sponsored the work be forgotten, both for its undertaking and for its achievement: the result, similar in format to Gomme's *Thucydides*, is a compact volume, which despite nearly 800 pages is a pleasure to handle; thanks to the page headings and four indexes it is also very easy to consult.

It is strange that a historian of the stature of Polybius has been so long neglected, particularly in the age of Spengler and Toynbee when men have sought to find patterns or rhythms of growth and decay in human history. One reason is clearly the language: if Polybius had possessed the foresight and ability to write in Thucydidean Greek so that his work would have been regarded as suitable reading matter for schools in the modern world (and his work contains many exciting stories), the fate of his *Histories* might have been very different. It is true that for the last seventy years undergraduates have had at their disposal J. L. Strachan-Davidson's *Selections*, but despite any stimulus that this may have provided, it would be rash to believe that an interest in Polybius has been widespread. That injustice may now more easily be righted. Political theorists have K. von Fritz's analysis of Polybius' political ideas in *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity* (1954), which reminds them of the history of this idea from Plato and Aristotle to Polybius, and from Polybius to Cicero and to Montesquieu, whose views on this topic had much influence in shaping the constitution of the United States. On Polybius as a political

thinker Walbank has much of great value to say, but his primary purpose has been what his title-page proclaims, an historical commentary on the content of Polybius' *Histories*. This is most timely: much interest has been shown in the interaction of Greek and Roman civilization and in attempting to analyse the respective contributions that are found in the 'Greco-Roman' civilization of the late Republic and early Empire. Now Walbank has turned the spot-light on to the period in history when the two developments were being fused into one, a period which is here described by the personal friend of Scipio Aemilianus whose so-called 'Circle' did so much to promote the blending of Greek and Roman ideas. Thus at last there is less excuse to neglect one of the world's most important historians, the study of whose work is rendered so much easier by Walbank's achievement.

The Commentary is preceded by an Introduction which deals with Polybius' life, views of history, attitude to Tyche, historical sources, and chronology; several aspects of these topics have already been considered in more detail by Walbank in articles elsewhere, and all receive illustration and exposition in the Commentary itself. The first impression that the Commentary makes is one of clarity and conciseness. It is constantly providing fine examples of discussions of disputed questions where the ancient evidence and modern interpretations are assembled and adjudged in masterly fashion and in brief space; the amount of material that Walbank has succeeded in packing into his pages is astonishing. Here he sets out exemplars in method from which younger students in particular could learn much, while all could benefit (especially in days when the price of each printed page tends to rise) from his skilful use of abbreviation in reference: and the gains from such a lesson would not be merely financial. The content of the Commentary is of course mainly historical; linguistic and textual matters are discussed chiefly in the context of Walbank's primary concern which is 'with whatever might help to elucidate what Polybius thought and said'. The text given in the lemmata is that of Büttner-Wobst (Teubner), even when a reading may be questioned in the accompanying note. The English translation by W. R. Paton (Loeb) is corrected where Walbank regards it as misleading or wrong; this was a helpful idea, since the edition of Polybius most used by English-speaking students is probably the Loeb, especially as the Teubner text itself is not easily available.

To establish a satisfactory line between what is and what is not relevant to a historical commentary is a problem that requires nice judgement. Walbank has worked on the principle that 'the contents, selection of material and emphasis should as far as possible be those laid down in advance by Polybius himself'. And of course it is not only Polybius' interests but also his shortcomings that are important: thus, for example, inevitably no little part of a commentary on the First Punic War must wrestle with such problems as the size of fleets and chronology. Here on the whole Walbank seems bravely to have withstood the temptation to turn a commentary into a history. He has not (in this volume at any rate) had recourse to the use of Appendixes, but at the same time he has managed to keep his discussions to reasonable length, so that they do not obtrude like rocky barriers to disturb the even flow of the commentary; on occasion they may reach three or four pages but these are generally broken down into subheadings. The range of topics that bristle with controversy is immense: to mention a few random examples, there are the nature of the *συνodus* of the Achaean League, the Athenian property-valuation

of 378 B.C., the date of Sellasia, the Ebro treaty, the early treaties between Rome and Carthage. These and dozens of other questions on causes of wars, battle-tactics, topography, geography, chronology, and sources, which might have tempted the author to very lengthy discussions, are tackled with good judgement and common sense: a neat path is hacked for the reader through what has often become a jungle of controversy and he is enabled to see each problem clearly posed and, where the evidence permits, a reasonable answer is suggested. To attempt here to discuss Walbank's views on any individual question would clearly be inappropriate. On minutiae each reader will no doubt find some points where he would have welcomed a little more, e.g. on the implication of ἀνά in ἀνεκράτο (p. 152; cf. 59) with some indication of the archaeological evidence, such as it is; a reference to the coins issued by the rebel Carthaginian mercenaries (cf. E. S. G. Robinson, *Num. Chron.*, 1943 and 1953); a closer linking of Polybius' description of types of *pila* with surviving contemporary examples (p. 705: since Pauly-Wissowa is not necessarily easily available); an explanation of καὶ τῶς, etc. in vi. 39. 15; a hint that the date of Themistocles' ostracism is uncertain (p. 725). It would have been useful to add to the thirteen maps others to show the Alpine passes and Cannae; some of the existing plans (e.g. 3, 4, or 9) could have been slightly reduced and thus have allowed room on the same page for more. Needless to say the references to modern literature are comprehensive and up to date: though Walbank could not take full account of work published after 1954, he has in fact been able to squeeze in references to many later publications, and in a work of this complexity that cannot have been easy.

In sum, Walbank has put a first-class tool into the hands of all students of the later Hellenistic and mid-Republican periods of history and, especially in his discussion of Book vi, of students of political thought; and its great value will no doubt become even increasingly more appreciated as it is constantly used. It would not be inappropriate to apply to his Commentary two phrases which appear in the title of the earliest English translation of the first five books of Polybius, that by Charles Watson in 1568: 'compendiously coercted' and 'a rich and goodly work'. Walbank's readers will also wish to echo some words that Pope Nicholas V wrote to Cardinal Perotti on 28 August 1452 when thanking him for his Latin translations of the first book of Polybius: 'optimum igitur ingenium tuum valde commendamus atque probamus, teque hortamur ut velis opus inchoatum perficere, nec labori parcas.'

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

## MATHEMATICAL THOUGHT IN ANTIQUITY

OSKAR BECKER: *Das mathematische Denken der Antike*. Pp. 128; 70 figs. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957. Paper, DM. 9.50.

DR. BECKER, who is already known for his *Grundlagen der Mathematik in geschichtlicher Entwicklung* and, in collaboration with J. E. Hofmann, his *Geschichte der Mathematik*, has now contributed a study of ancient mathematics to the series *Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft*. He disclaims any intention of writing a history of ancient mathematics—which would, indeed, be impossible in the allotted space—but by means of selected examples he contrives to give a useful picture of the mathematical achievement of antiquity.

These examples are preceded by a brief historical introduction in which Becker glances at the early gropings of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Indians and rapidly sketches the development of mathematics in the lands of the Greeks from Thales to Anthemius of Tralles. The bulk of the work is, however, rightly given to concrete examples which alone can give the true tang of the mathematical work of antiquity. Though Becker's own interests may be partly responsible for the relatively few examples drawn from Egyptian and Babylonian sources, and the much larger number derived from Greek texts, this is not disproportionate to the relative importance of Greek and non-Greek mathematics. After a period of enthusiasm in which the primacy of the Babylonians was asserted, the supremacy of the Greek achievement is again undisputed; indeed, the best of Babylonian mathematics comes at such a late period that if there was any borrowing it may as well have been from the Greeks as by the Greeks.

The mathematical thought of antiquity is therefore, in the main, the mathematical thought of the Greeks, and it is with the Greek achievement that Becker's pages are almost wholly concerned. After a chapter on the geometry of Thales and the arithmetic of the Pythagoreans, in which the Greek mathematicians were feeling their way, we get a description of the solution of algebraic problems by geometric methods, in which they began first to show their real abilities. Then we get an account of the three great problems in which they first came to grips with the higher mathematics—the doubling of a cube, the trisection of an angle, and the construction of a square equal to a circle. A brief chapter is properly devoted to the strengthening of the theory of proportion so as to extend it to incommensurable magnitudes; this superb logical achievement was the work of Eudoxus, though we know it through Euclid. There follows an all too brief note on the anticipations of the integral calculus by Archimedes, and more substantial sections on the foundations of Greek trigonometry and on the problems in the theory of numbers so brilliantly solved by Diophantus.

One aspect of the plan followed by Becker is that the great trio Euclid, Archimedes, Apollonius, do not stand out in all their majesty as they would in a corpus of Greek mathematics. Their achievements are noted, but distributed throughout the book. It can only be by an oversight that in the brief bibliography Becker refers the reader to the Greek text of Aristarchus published by Wallis in 1688 (and to Nokk's German translation of 1854) but not to Heath's Greek text of 1913.

London

IVOR BULMER-THOMAS

## ANCIENT LOGIC

OSKAR BECKER: *Zwei Untersuchungen zur antiken Logik*. (Klass.-Philol. Studien, 17.) Pp. 55. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957. Paper, DM. 6.

THE two interesting essays here grouped under the title 'Ancient Logic' concern Plato's Ideal Numbers and the four *θέματα* of Stoic logic.

The first essay rehandles a subject previously tackled by Becker in 1931 when he adopted and improved Stenzel's theory of the connexion between Ideal Numbers and the method of Division prominent in some of Plato's later dialogues. Becker's view was criticized by van der Wielen and by Ross (*Plato's*



*Theory of Ideas*, 1951, pp. 194–8, where references are given to the works above mentioned), and the interest of Becker's essay for English readers will largely consist in his efforts to counter Ross's criticisms. It may be said at once that to Ross's main criticism, that there seems no reason to suppose that *διαίρεσις* had anything to do with the Ideal Numbers, Becker makes no reasoned reply, contenting himself with a reaffirmation of his view (p. 20).

Becker's discussion of Plato's generation of the Ideal Numbers commences with Aristotle's statement (*Met. A.* 987<sup>b</sup>14 ff.) that from the One and the dyad of the great and the small 'the numbers *ἐξ ὧν τῶν πρώτων* were aptly generated, as in a plastic material'. The doubling power of the dyad to which Aristotle so often refers is taken by Becker to imply also its *halving* power ('whereby the number of the parts is doubled' p. 6), and he largely agrees with Robin's final suggestion for the generation of the numbers (Ross, p. 193, B), except that he would derive 6 from splitting the difference between 4 and 8, and 10 from splitting that between 8 and 12. Objection might be taken, not only to the halving function attributed to the dyad, but also to the unnatural order in which the numbers are generated and particularly the need to go beyond the number 10 in order to generate it.

The words *ἐξ ὧν τῶν πρώτων* left untranslated above naturally receive much discussion, and here I fancy Becker may have the better of it. Ross understands them to mean 'except the primes', as in themselves they might, and believes that Aristotle is here criticizing Plato's attempt as failing when applied to prime numbers, and succeeding only with 2 and its powers and, to a lesser extent, with other even numbers. But in the series of numbers from 2 to 10, which is alone in question according to Ross, what happens with regard to 9? It is neither an even number nor a prime. Ross is reduced to suggesting that Aristotle simply forgot it, or else that it is tacitly included with the prime number 3, as being generable therefrom. Becker maintains his original rendering 'beyond the first numbers' (1 and 2).

Becker suggests (p. 16) much as before that Plato's Divisions were illustrated by successive cutting of a horizontal straight line, and not by a 'genealogical tree' as is usually assumed nowadays. The language employed by Plato (e.g. *διχῇ τμητέον*) might perhaps at first sight favour such an interpretation. Yet the method is hardly one which would have been found convenient in use for any lengthy Division. There will be difficulty too in explaining, for example, *Sophist* 266 a 1–2. (For a similar suggestion cf. A. C. Lloyd, *C.Q.*, Jan.–Apr. 1952.)

The reader of Becker's essay will have been wondering what reply, if any, Becker will make to Ross's point that in the few cases where we are given actual examples of numbers attached to Platonic Ideas there is no trace of 'Division'. We hear, for example, of 2, 3, and 4 in connexion with Ideas of line, plane, and solid. Aristotle tells us that the underlying matter 'of which the Forms are predicated in the case of sensible things, and the One in the case of Forms' is the dyad of the great and the small. Becker says that one must distinguish two types of great and small and two types of number in the intelligible and sensible fields. In the intelligible, the number is 'the number of Ideas to be found in the divisional . . . definition'; in the sensible or 'quasi-sensible' field of line, plane, and solid, it 'gives the dimension of the great-and-small' (p. 19). Thus Becker makes a special case of almost the only instance we are given of Plato's own number allocation.

Of three attractive emendations proposed by way of envoi, attention may be called to Aristotle, *Met. M.* 1084<sup>a</sup>6 τῷ for ὥδι.

The second essay is concerned to reconstruct the lost fourth θέμα of Stoic logic. The Stoic propositional logic is a system of rules of inference consisting of five 'indemonstrable syllogisms' (e.g. the 3rd: 'Not (the first and the second); but the first; therefore not the second') and four 'themata', two of which are known and a third probably known. These themata are, as it were, super-rules of inference, by means of which one rule of inference is derived from another (e.g. the 1st: 'If the first and the second, then the third; therefore, if the first (or the second) and the contradictory of the third, then the contradictory of the second (or the first)'). Themata are employed along with 'indemonstrables' in the reduction of syllogisms.

On the assumption 'that the Stoic system of propositional logic really was complete and in that respect equivalent to what is to-day called the two-valued 'classical' calculus of propositions' (p. 40) and bearing in mind a hint contained in Alexander's commentary on *Prior Analytics* i, Becker conjectures that the fourth thema was a law of conjunction, expressible as follows: *ἐὰν ἐκ δυεῖν τρίτον τι συνάγῃται, ἐκ τοῦ συμπλεγμένου ἐκείνων συναχθήσεται τὸ αὐτό* (p. 43), i.e. 'if the first and the second, then the third; therefore, if (the first and the second), then the third'. If the reader feels somewhat disappointed with this and inclined to agree with Alexander for whom 'the fourth Stoic thema must have been without real meaning' (p. 43), he should recall Łukasiewicz's remark that the logic of the Stoics ('a masterpiece equal to the logic of Aristotle') is both formal and formalistic. The suggested fourth thema might nowadays be represented as follows (p. 49):

$$\frac{P, Q \rightarrow R}{(P \text{ et } Q) \rightarrow R}$$

Its use for the Stoics would be to permit the substitution of  $(P \text{ et } Q) \rightarrow R$  for  $P, Q \rightarrow R$  at any desired stage in the reduction of a syllogism.

The essay is followed by a number of proposed textual emendations, mainly concerned with the *ψευδόμενος* puzzle. Attention may be called to Becker's proposals for Cicero, *Academica* ii. 95 ff.

University of Adelaide

J. R. TREVASKIS

## HORACE

Q. Horatius Flaccus: (1) *Oden und Epoden*, (2) *Briefe*. Erklärt von ADOLF KIESSLING: 8./5. Auflage besorgt/bearbeitet von RICHARD HEINZE. Mit Nachwort und bibliographischen Nachträgen von ERICH BURCK. Pp. viii+620; 425. Berlin: Weidmann, 1955, 1957. Cloth, DM. 14 each.

THESE new 'Auflagen' (actually reprints with appendixes) of Kiessling-Heinze are most welcome, for this is one of the indispensable commentaries, especially for the *Odes*, and was out of print. The English reader, usually dependent on the Wickham, or on the Page, Palmer, and Wilkins, of Victorian times is particularly ill-provided. He now has Professor Fraenkel's book, but that designedly leaves a considerable portion of the works untouched.

The seventh edition of the *Odes* and *Epodes* (1930), being exactly reproduced here, still requires for one portion the list of additions and corrections from Heinze's manuscript notes, which will be found on pp. 567-8. In the preface to the sixth edition (1917) Heinze stated that he had altered so much that it should no longer be considered as a revision of Kiessling. But one of his chief merits goes back to Kiessling, his awareness of the extent of Horace's debt to Greek literature, both in the conception of many poems and in details, which is brought out by the wealth of analogies cited. This amounted to a revolution. For instance, the summing-up of the form of iv. 4 begins: 'Horaz hat sich in diesem ἐπιτύκῳ Pindar so weit genähert, wie er es tun konnte, ohne in offenkundige *imitatio* zu verfallen.' Turn to Wickham's edition and you will find no reference to Pindar in the introduction to this poem, and only two or three casual ones in the notes; turn to Page and you will seek for Pindar's name in vain. But while Kiessling was struck by the amount of Greek influence he found, Heinze, having taken this into account, laid more stress on the manner in which Horace transformed it into something essentially Roman and actual (see p. 570).

Heinze's other great virtue is his sturdy common sense. If he had a fault, it was an excess of seriousness, and in particular, a tendency to attribute to Augustan poets a modern religious attitude to the gods. *Mercuri facunde* is not a personal prayer ending in a hope of a blessed after-life, nor is *Parvus deorum* testimony to a conversion. Fraenkel has put his finger on this, and has also noted his tendency to *Systemzwang*. Is ii. 15, a 'riddle' because it has no addressee? (i. 34 also has none, as it happens.)

The reprint is followed by a valuable appendix by Erich Burck (pp. 569-620). A brief assessment of the contributions of Kiessling and Heinze is followed by a survey *à la* Bursian of Horatian scholarship since 1930 (since 1917 for iv. 9, onwards, the part Heinze left unrevised at his death). There are sections on various aspects, with bibliographies (admittedly incomplete) and finally a short bibliography for each poem (excluding works already dealt with). Fraenkel's book unfortunately appeared too late for inclusion.

The section on the text contains a table of readings from the latest editions, Heinze, Villeneuve (1927-54), Lenchantin de Gubernatis (1945), Klingner (1939-50). Usually Klingner supports Heinze. Both rightly have Peerlkamp's *illa* at iii. 20. 8, and Bentley's *clare* at i. 20. 5 (Klingner wrongly cited for *care*, 1950); Heinze seems right in reading Canter's *trahenti* at iii. 15. 5, wrong in not having a stop at *Vergilium* at i. 3. 6, as against Klingner. All four texts prefer what is surely the inferior reading at ii. 12. 28 (*occupet*), ii. 18. 30 (*fine*); iii. 27. 5 and 15 (*rumpat*; *uetet*), and all seem too conservative in rejecting certain emendations, e.g. i. 16. 8, *si*; i. 20. 10, *uides*; ii. 10. 9, *saeuius*; iii. 5. 8, *aruis*; *Epodes* 1. 5, *sit*; 8. 17 *magis*. As to the manuscript tradition, Klingner's version is certainly an improvement on Vollmer's. The Botschuyver scholia are unfortunately of little value for Horace.

In the 1917 edition Kiessling's section on the metrical art of Horace was omitted, in view of the forthcoming appearance of Heinze's revolutionary article 'Die lyrischen Verse des Horaz' (*S.B.* lxx. 4, Leipzig, 1918). The conclusions of this article have been widely accepted, and it is a pity that the edition still lacks a section based on them.

The fourth edition of the *Epistles* (1914) is reprinted with two appendixes. The first consists of Heinze's essay in *Neue Jahrbücher*, xliii, 1919 (= *Vom*

*Geist des Römertums*, 236-54), in which he made the point that the *Epistles* of Book i, taken together, form a piece of conscious self-portraiture for its own sake, and as such are unique in antiquity, since other autobiographical works were either not intended as such (Lucilius), or self-justifications (Isocrates in *Antidosis*), or related to a norm of perfection (Seneca, Augustine). Whether Epicurus' letters had the direct influence on the choice of form that Heinze suggested, is more doubtful; Horace had always addressed poems to individuals, and in substance the later *Satires*, especially ii. 6, led naturally on to the *Epistles*. The second appendix is a survey by Burck analogous to that in the volume of *Odes* and *Epodes*. Heinze, in the third edition (1908), subjected Kiessling to a thorough overhaul, and continued the process, except as regards the Epistle to the Pisones, in the fourth. A table of readings shows where Heinze himself in his 'Bibliotheca Mundi' edition (1921), or one at least of Keller and Holder, Vollmer, Villeneuve, and Klingner, differs from the text in this volume.

Burck's survey of works published since 1914 begins with E. Courbaud's substantial book, too little known in England (like others that appeared in 1914), which Fraenkel has now brought to the fore. (Courbaud's contention that in the years 23-20 Horace was undergoing a conversion from Epicureanism to Stoicism seems, however, an overstatement, if not a misconception.) Klingner's essay in *Antike* xii, 1936 (= *Römische Geisteswelt*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 301 ff.) is rightly commended. For ii. 1 Fraenkel's chapter is a most important addition (he does not deal with ii. 2 or *A.P.*). Pp. 401-18 comprise a valuable survey of the controversy over *A.P.* aroused by Norden's famous article of 1905 and Jensen's discoveries in Philodemus, particularly necessary because the latter were not published until four years after Heinze's last edition. Would his introduction and commentary have been very different if he had been able to take account of the debate which has continued for a generation, roughly between the extremes of Rostagni's edition of 1930, in which *A.P.* is seen as a work of neo-classicism constructed on the basis of a Hellenistic treatise and reflecting Peripatetic views and interests, and of Imtnisch's work (1932) maintaining that it bears directly on contemporary topics? One may venture the opinion that, as far as arrangement goes, Burck is right in concluding (p. 418) that, while much insight has been gained from all this focusing of attention, we are in general back where Heinze was. No cut-and-dried divisions will work (any more than in the earlier part of Cicero's *De Oratore* iii). This is *sermo*, as Klingner emphasized. But as regards subject-matter we may suspect that Heinze, if he could have used Jensen's work, would have been less ready to assume that the matters Horace chose to treat must have been selected for their bearing on the current state of Roman poetry.

King's College, Cambridge

L. P. WILKINSON

### THE COMPOSITION OF THE *AENEID*

GIOVANNI D'ANNA: *Il Problema della Composizione dell' Eneide*. Pp. 132. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1957. Paper, L. 1,400.

THOUGH scholars have been discussing the composition of the *Aeneid* for nearly a hundred years, no generally accepted conclusions have resulted. Discrepancies



between different parts of the work have been recognized, and have been attributed to changes of plan in the course of composition; but they can be and have been differently interpreted. Some scholars, for instance, have considered the third book to be the earliest or one of the earliest; but they are balanced by an equal number who have given it a late date. In these circumstances it might well be thought that the problem could be pursued no farther and must be left as insoluble.

Professor d'Anna does not share this view. An admiring pupil of Paratore, he holds that his master's work on Suetonius, *De Poetis*, and on Virgil has provided a foundation for a new approach to the problem. His conclusions are as follows. The oldest parts of the *Aeneid* are the final portions of Books vi and viii; then came Book vii, the remainder of viii and Books ix to xii. Virgil then turned to the 'libri Odissiaci'; he composed Book ii and the first part of Book vi, then the fourth book and the original first book (the present Book iii in its earliest form); next came the present first and the fifth books, and finally the rewriting of the wanderings of Aeneas as part of Aeneas' own story to follow his account of the fall of Troy. We are not, however, to suppose that Virgil necessarily composed whole books together, and the early books were subject to later revision.

It is worth noting that, unlike others, such as Gercke, who have argued for the priority of the second half of the *Aeneid* over the first, d'Anna does not believe that Virgil at first intended to write only of the wars of Aeneas in Latium and later changed his plan. Although he attaches little importance to Donatus's story of Virgil's having first written a prose draft of his epic (this he regards as non-Suetonian and contradicted by other evidence), he holds that the first half of the poem was in Virgil's mind from the beginning, at least in outline. This perhaps makes his general thesis rather less plausible, for *prima facie* one would expect an author who has decided on the plan of his work to begin at the beginning rather than in the middle. Nor is the external evidence as strong as d'Anna makes out. There is no real certainty that Propertius' lines *qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitāt arma iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus* mean that at the time they were written (when, according to Suetonius, the *Aeneid* had only just been begun) Virgil was engaged on the second half of the poem. Though they can be so interpreted, they need not mean more than that Propertius had a general idea of the plot of the epic. The point is of some importance, because in d'Anna's view the internal evidence is not in itself sufficient to establish a chronology without the support of the Propertian passage.

None the less, in the reviewer's opinion, d'Anna makes out a good case at least for the priority of Books vii and viii to Book iii. He does not carry much conviction in regard to the concluding portions of Books vi and viii, on which he closely follows Paratore. He refers to the connexion between Book vi and the end of *Georgics* iv, which he believes to have been rewritten after the death of Gallus. But similarity does not imply contemporaneity, and most readers of Virgil would probably consider that the difference between the treatment of the underworld in these two works could only be explained by a considerable lapse of time between them. Nor does it seem likely that Virgil began this episode in the middle, and although d'Anna states that 'it is not illogical to suppose that Virgil at first wrote only what was to be the conclusion of Aeneas's catabasis', he gives the impression here of being hardly convinced himself.

In arguing the early date of the conclusion of Book viii he makes much of the evidence of Propertius (ii. 34. 61-62). But it is far from certain that Propertius alludes to the description of Actium in Book viii. He seems to contrast what Virgil could tell of (*dicere posse*) with what he is actually writing (*qui nunc*, etc.). Following, as elsewhere, Paratore, d'Anna regards the Homeric elements in the *Aeneid* as something not essential to the work, but superimposed and, in general, belonging to the later period of the epic's composition. Thus he suggests that Book xii with its numerous Homeric echoes may have been worked over some time after its first composition. He does not observe that one of the most obvious Homeric imitations is the arming of Aeneas and the description of his shield, which he regards as one of the earliest portions of the work.

If d'Anna has not said the last word on this difficult problem, he has at any rate written a thorough and useful study which does justice to the complexity of the question. His work is somewhat marred by an excessive deference to Paratore. Those who find Paratore more stimulating than convincing will wish that his pupil had applied his critical faculties as freely to his master's views as to those of other scholars.

University College of North Wales, Bangor

M. L. CLARKE

### RVDIS INDIGESTAQUE MOLES

FRANCO MUNARI: *Catalogue of the MSS of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. (I.S.C. Bulletin, Supplement No. 4.) Pp. 74. London: Institute of Classical Studies and Warburg Institute, 1957. Paper, 10s. net.

By the compilation and publication of this catalogue the author and the Institute of Classical Studies have put both classical and medieval scholars in their debt. Munari modestly allows that 'the present Catalogue is probably neither complete nor fully reliable in all minute details'; and future users will be bound to discover errors and omissions that must elude most reviewers. But Munari's edition of the *Amores* is sufficient testimony to his accuracy, and nobody will hold him personally responsible for particulars (especially dates) taken from published catalogues and not verified by autopsy. Of the 390 manuscripts listed here 33 have been destroyed or cannot now be traced; of the remaining 357 Munari has, by my count, seen 177 (chiefly those in Bologna, Florence, Milan, Rome, Paris, London, Oxford, and Cambridge), a very respectable total, especially when it appears that Heinsius himself only saw some 70 of them. Not only future editors of the *Metamorphoses* are going to be thankful to Munari for his careful performance of what must at times have been a tedious and ungrateful task.

The manuscripts are listed in alphabetical order of their Latin names (usually by collections, e.g. *Ambrosianus*, not *Mediolanensis*), an arrangement which studies the convenience of the classical scholar and editor and has tradition in its favour; though some users of the catalogue may wish that Kristeller's method had been followed, since one can see that these lists will be used together. The amount of information available about each item of course varies enormously: the particulars include, where they are known, owners, collators and editors (particularly Heinsius) and their sigla, references to the technical literature and catalogues, and a note of the existence of photographs

at the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in a good many cases (valuable for, for example, Tornacensis 99, destroyed in 1940). Another useful adjunct is a list of common metrical subscriptions, which are noted by a key-word in the individual entries. It might have been preferable to indicate in some obvious way, such as bracketing, manuscripts now irretrievably lost, but after all there are not many of these. The only complaint of substance which I have to make is against Munari's decision to omit 'several fragments and excerpts' to save space: for medieval excerpts from Ovid, though usually (not always) valueless to the editor, have some importance for the historian, as Ullman's work has shown, and if, for example, Par. Lat. 7647 and 17903 are included, Escorialensis Q. I. 14 has at least an equal claim (and a better than Leidensis B.P.L. 195A (1662!) or Bergomas Bibl. Civ. 5. 20 'probably schoolbook of an ignorant pupil').

With these reasonably complete data before us, a brief analysis of the material may be of interest. The distribution by centuries of *surviving* manuscripts is roughly as follows: roughly, since it will be understood that some of the dates must be received sceptically, and on some there is disagreement among the pundits (see, for example, nos. 111 Copenhagen fragment of the lost Spirensis, 178 Marc. Flor. 225, 371 Vat. Urb. 342). I have necessarily been somewhat arbitrary in my treatment of these, usually accepting the mean dating, since my purpose is merely to sketch the general picture.

Before the eleventh century: 5 (all fragmentary).

Of the eleventh century: 5 (three fragmentary; and of the remaining two, the star witness,<sup>1</sup> Marc. Flor. 225, belongs to the incomplete class, ending at xiv. 830. The other, B.M. King's 26, is complete, except for ii. 542-77; Slater observes of it 'sua habet bona', but it is evidently not a mainstay of the text).

Of the eleventh or twelfth century: 8 (three, in varying degrees, incomplete, including the other star witness, Neap. IV. F. 3, which ends at xiv. 838.

It is in any case included here *honoris causa*, since Lowe—it is Beneventan—has dated it to the twelfth century).

Of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: 133.

Later than the thirteenth century: 206.

There do not seem to be any surprises in the way of hitherto unknown early manuscripts, unless one counts such scraps as those in the eleventh-century St. Gall 864 (contains ii. 642-83) and Par. Lat. 17901 (i. 1-39). It remains to be seen whether any of the later manuscripts unknown to or unregarded by editors, of which I count well over two hundred, will prove a valuable addition to the apparatus criticus. Experience teaches that this is unlikely, but there is no harm in hoping. An editor of this text needs all the help he can get from the *recentiores*, as the figures which I have just given clearly show, but the task of coping with this cloud of witnesses will be an unenviable one. Even if one were to start by ignoring everything copied after the thirteenth century, a proceeding by which in practice little would be lost<sup>2</sup> (except the conjectures of the *Itali*, but these, I imagine, must now be sufficiently well known), the remaining mass would still be formidable. It is impossible to determine the

<sup>1</sup> Its credit has been impugned in an unpublished dissertation by W. F. Smith (see *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, xxxvi [1925], 183-4).

<sup>2</sup> Knoche came to much the same conclusion about manuscripts of Juvenal 'vom 12. Jht. ab' (*Handschriftliche Grundlagen*, pp. 60-62.).

'goodness' or 'badness' (indeed in this context the terms have little meaning), let alone the affiliation, of most manuscripts of Ovid by the collation of test passages (cf. Pasquali, *Storia della Trad.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 36 n. 1 'egli stesso [Maas] non si nasconde che "saggi" non bastano a metterci al sicuro da sorprese'), because, as Housman observed of Lucan, 'the true line of division is between the variants themselves, not between the manuscripts which offer them'. The tinkering of the *aetas Ovidiana*, confusing as they are, cannot take all the blame for this: it is clear that the process of contamination was well advanced before the twelfth century (compare Slater, p. 19, on 'Cur ἐκλεκτικῶς edendum sit poema'). Fragments of truth, not attributable to conjecture, survive in unexpected places, and the editor must take them as he finds them. Munari's catalogue for the first time displays the full magnitude of his task.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

## JUVENAL

AUGUSTO SERAFINI: *Studio sulla satira di Giovenale*. Pp. xii+441. Florence: Le Monnier, 1957. Paper, L. 4,000.

RATHER more than half of Serafini's book is devoted to an examination of what he considers the three outstanding Juvenalian problems (1) the historical truth of his satire, (2) his moral outlook, (3) his poetical art.

1. Were things as black as Juvenal painted them? Serafini's conclusion is that in spite of his frequent exaggerations and his enormous omissions he is a truthful and important witness to the spiritual decline of Rome: 'Egli ha insomma assoluta sfiducia nell' impero e nel vano dilatarsi di esso, perchè sente che gli manca quel sostegno morale che fece grande il passato' (p. 92, cf. p. 96). Serafini's examination of the evidence here, particularly that for Rome's progressive moral decay (pp. 16-37) is not as critical as it should be; most of it does not relate to a time later than Domitian, and more allowance must be made for exaggeration and axe-grinding. At the time of their publication the Satires were anything but topical, and it does not look as if they found many readers. But Serafini's most serious error seems to me to lie in ascribing to Juvenal a real understanding of the moral and social problems of his age, an understanding such as is implied by the extract I have quoted. Juvenal was not a thinker, and his attacks (on symptoms, not diseases) are essentially vague, a generalized and emotional expression of a pessimism that many felt (this emerges clearly from Serafini's excellent collection of parallels) and that in default of understanding yearned uselessly for the morality of a largely mythical past.

2. His moral outlook. It was based on sentiment (p. 158). This surely raises what for most readers is the crucial Juvenalian question, with which Serafini does not really grapple: his sincerity and his effectiveness. Was this sentiment real? It is easy to see why he was esteemed in the Middle Ages as a moral author, and Serafini's interpretation of the Tenth Satire (pp. 383-406) shows well that he was one of several writers in whom at about this time pagan and Christian lines of thought were converging. But the satirist, above all other writers perhaps, is judged by his effect on his readers. Is Juvenal effective? The answer to this question need not necessarily depend on whether a reader finds



the *ridiculum* in satire more effective than the *acre*, nor are true pathos and rhetoric incompatible. The same writer can use both with equal power: this is from the same book as Coodle and Doodle, and is nothing if not rhetorical:

Dead, your Majesty. Dead, my lords and gentlemen. Dead, Right Reverends and Wrong Reverends of every order. Dead, men and women, born with Heavenly compassion in your hearts. And dying thus around us, every day.

Anaphora, alliteration, paronomasia, *wachsende Glieder*, and a line of verse by way of clausula. But the great heart of the man who wrote those words and who would weep as he wrote is unmistakable: *si vis me flere, dolendum est*. Is there in Juvenal a sign of the generous spirit that glows in Dickens, in Aristophanes, in Rabelais, even in Swift? (Serafini devotes a chapter 'Il nuovo Lucilio' to a comparison between Juvenal and Lucilius, but though the comparison is not absurd it cannot be extended to the characters of the two men.) Is Juvenal more than, in Martha's phrase, 'un décorateur de pensées communes'? He was of course unlucky to live in times when it was almost impossible (the *Apocolocyntosis* being such an exception as proves the rule) to write real personal satire: in this connexion Serafini's elaborate explanation (pp. 149-54) of his satirizing the dead is waste of ingenuity; Quintilian (ix. 2. 68) shows clearly how the wind blew. He championed the poor and the oppressed (pp. 313-28), but they were the poor of his own class: the really poor man has more to worry about than seeming ridiculous. Are the tribulations of clients as retailed by Juvenal and Martial matter to wring the heart? And his sympathy with slaves (pp. 328-35) falls far short of, for example, Seneca's. His hankering for the past (pp. 111-19), in which he was not alone, is a nostalgia born of ignorance rather than an expression of what Dill called his 'profound moral sense' (compare in this connexion the remarks of Marmorale, *Giovenale* p. 96, which Serafini quotes in disparagement on p. 380, n. 114, on Juvenal's anachronistic attitude to Greeks). Serafini's discussion of such points is apt to consist of a citation of a *locus philosophumenus*, admitted to be such, but justified by the simple plea that these were sentiments sincerely held. Each reader must be his own judge of that; but this approach is apt to lose sight of the whole Juvenal. Is the *total* impression made by his satires that of a great or even a considerable moralist?

3. His art. The chapter on this theme should be read with the two following on rhetoric and the grand style in Juvenal. They contain much that is of interest, though the discussions are occasionally marred by excessive subtlety (e.g. p. 214 on homoeoteleuton at 10. 185-6, 3. 66) and a characteristic exaggeration (pp. 147, 174 on Juvenal as one of Rome's major bucolic poets) that finds its climax in the suggestion (p. 248) that Juvenal exemplifies Quintilian's ideal combination of the *orator* and the *uir bonus*. To give a balanced picture much more should have been said about his very real defects of style. But as Martha well remarked (*Les moralistes*, pp. 316-17), Juvenal seems to infect his critics with his own hyperbole: I do not think that it is mere insular sang-froid which looks askance at the recurrence of terms like 'stupendo', 'forza veramente titanica', 'michelangiolesco' (applied to 6. 1-13).

Serafini tends to be prolix and repetitious, partly because of the division of his subject-matter, partly because of an almost morbid passion for quoting from modern scholars; and there are a good many places where the argument

should be scrutinized carefully. There are some near-howlers (e.g. the interpretations at p. 117 of 8. 117-22, at p. 388 of 10. 50, and at p. 396 of 10. 276-82; and metrical bloomers at pp. 274, 284, 367). The texts used are those of Labriolle-Villeneuve and Owen (!), which means that not infrequently Serafini's warmest commendations are lavished on verses which the best editors have not thought to be Juvenal's; though the name of Knoche (also thinly disguised as 'Knocke': there is a regrettable carelessness about the niceties of proper names, and 'Scaligerus' is really culpable) often occurs, it is never as Juvenal's editor, neither his edition nor Housman's being mentioned. The Greek quotations are badly printed. Even though it may not fulfil its author's hopes of imparting a new direction to Juvenalian studies (p. xi)—to be quite honest, I see little about it that is new—this is a sincere and thoughtful book which can be read with profit even by those who differ from some of its chief conclusions. Its value would have been increased if, while it was still in typescript, it had undergone disciplinary treatment by a benevolent but stern critic.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

## THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PLANCUS AND CICERO

GEROLD WALSER: *Der Briefwechsel des L. Munatius Plancus mit Cicero*. Im Auftrag der Historischen und Antiquarischen Gesellschaft zu Basel anlässlich der 2000 Jahrfeier der Stadt Basel mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar herausgegeben. Pp. 207; 5 plates, map. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1957. Cloth, 10.45 Sw. fr.

THIS little book is intended to mark the bimillenary of the foundation, by Plancus, of Colonia Raurica, now Augst near Basel. It contains (i) a 31-page General Introduction on the career and character of Plancus; (ii) a text of *Ad Fam.* x. 1-24, xi. 13 a (though not of the earlier letter xiii. 29), with a parallel German translation; the letters are arranged in chronological order, and each is provided with its own Introduction setting it in its historical context; (iii) 23 pages of Notes, almost exclusively historical, on the text; (iv) 5 pages of bibliographical matter, and an Index of Names.

'Wissenschaftlichen Ehrgeiz hat die Publikation nicht', says the editor in his Preface. Nevertheless it is, in the main, a scholarly piece of work. The editorial matter is excellent: it is a model of lucidity, and shows the requisite mastery of the relevant literature, to which there are ample references both in the footnotes of the General Introduction and in the historical Notes on the text. The text itself is that of Mendelssohn, except that in a few places where Mendelssohn was ultra-conservative the editor sensibly adopts another reading; at x. 11. 2 there is an impossible conflation of two methods of punctuation, one of which is followed in the translation and the other supported in the editor's note; and at x. 24. 6 (after *salutari*) there is a misleading full stop.

The editor tells us that the translation is based on that of F. D. Gräter, who completed Wieland's translation of the whole of Cicero's correspondence (arranged in chronological order); but that in many places, to make it easier

for the reader to understand the letters, he has modernized the wording, although this has had the disadvantage of eliminating 'den schönen altertümlichen Stil der Wielandzeit'. In fact the revision has been very thorough, and the result often reads like a completely new translation. Gräter's verbosity is pruned wherever possible, and occasionally over-pruned by the omission of words which are essential for a full rendering of the Latin; e.g. x. 1 'ändern' (*ceteris*), 12. 1 'als Sieger' (*victorem*), 13. 2 'durch dich', 15. 2 'in diesem Zuge' (*in cursu*), 24. 5 'so lang er lebte' (*vivo illo*). On the other hand, at 11. 2 an accidental omission of Gräter (*idque me praestaturum spero*) is not made good. In places Gräter's accurate translation is replaced by a loose paraphrase, as at 24. 2, *nihil enim me non salutariter cogitare scio*: 'denn ich bin mir bewußt, nichts als das Gemeinwohl vor Augen zu haben' (Gräter); 'ich weiß, daß ich mir in dieser Hinsicht nichts vorzuwerfen brauche' (Walser). More frequently individual Latin words, adequately and exactly rendered by Gräter, are less adequately or quite wrongly rendered by Walser; e.g. 8. 6 *morari* is 'verzögern' (Gräter), not 'vermindern'; 9. 3 *genere* (sc. *copiarum*) is 'Art' (Gräter; the troops are experienced in battle), not 'Gesinnung'; 11. 1 *arbitrium* is 'Urteil' (Gräter), not 'Gegenwart'. Finally at 8. 3 *funestam orbi terrarum victoriam* ('einen für den ganzen Weltkreis höchst traurigen Sieg', Gräter) is completely misinterpreted ('einen höchst unheilvollen Sieg über das ganze Reich'). In such cases the editor has eliminated not only the beautiful old-fashioned style but the beautiful old-fashioned accuracy of the age of Wieland. Fortunately these lapses are not very numerous; the translation as a whole is good, although I think it would have been better if the revision of Gräter's work had been less drastic.

On the printing side more care should have been taken to see that the pages of the translation correspond to the pages of the original; as it is, the advantages of a parallel translation are lost in the longer letters, since it takes nearly three pages of German to render two pages of Latin. Apart from this inconvenience to the reader, the book is admirably produced. The illustrations are excellent, except the map on p. 124, which is poor.

University of Aberdeen

W. S. WATT

## GOD AND FATE

IRO KAJANTO: *God and Fate in Livy*. (Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, B. 64.) Pp. 115. Turku: Turun Yliopiston Kustantama, 1957. Paper, mk. 400.

In the interpretation of Livy recent criticism has moved on from strictly historical or literary treatment until, with Klingner's work, we may appreciate the main principle of Roman political judgement in terms of *virtus* alongside *fortuna*. It is an important conception which calls for closer definition of both Augustan and Livian usage. Erkell has examined the general significance of *augustus*, *felicitas*, and *fortuna* (1952), and now Kajanto analyses Livy's use of *fatum* and *fortuna*, in illustrating his attitude towards fate and the gods in Roman history. This study is acute, intelligent, and sound—a valuable contribution to Livian criticism.

Kajanto first shows how Roman ideas about superhuman elements in history fell under Greek influence, with emphasis upon *fortuna* in Ciceronian times,

and how the Pax Augusta brought the conception of divine destiny into prominence. In Praef. 8 Livy subordinates the early legends *et his similia* to treatment of the *vita, mores, viri, and artes* of Rome. Kajanto takes this contrast to prove that Livy rejected an interpretation in terms of 'irrational factors' in favour of a 'sociological and psychological' interpretation. This is to press the implications of *his similia* too far; but there can be little doubt that Livy was primarily concerned to interpret Roman history in human terms. In his subsequent discussion of the detailed evidence Kajanto allows for the traditional character of much of Livy's subject-matter and for conventional or rhetorical forms in his expression. In particular, he is cautious about using the speeches, with their 'characterisation' of men and events, as evidence for Livy's own beliefs. He very sensibly redresses the balance of current fashion by warning us against making too much of Camillus' famous speech (v. 51 ff.). The prodigy lists, he adds, since they do not appear in 'causal connection' with other events, should not be assumed to reflect any Stoic ideas of divination. This is a proper distinction between sentimental traditionalism and positive historical theory.

Kajanto then studies Livy's use of *fatum*, which—though it may have been influenced by the prevailing Stoicism—is in a transitional stage of developing usage. Discounting the speeches, he finds in the narrative that the word represents either 'providential ordering', especially in reference to the founding and early history of Rome, or, as elsewhere, a sinister power of destruction. The majority of instances appear in the First Decade, where 'the idea of *fatum* as a cause of events is more appropriate to the legendary past'. The question of *fortuna* is more complicated. Kajanto deals with the personal *fortuna populi Romani*, as found alone or with *virtus*. The phrase here seems to refer to a guardian spirit which aided the citizens in defending the Roman state. Although it may go back to the traditional idea of divine approval for piety, he attributes its form to the influence of the Hellenistic *τύχη* of a city. We may allow more than he does to the Roman tendency to specialize deities; but there are clear instances of the usage, and he applies his argument at vi. 30. 6 to support Gronovius's emendation: 'quidquid superfuit fortuna populi Romani et militum . . . virtus tutata est (quidquid superfuit fortunae . . . id militum . . . virtus, MSS)'; cf. xxxv. 6. 9. Among the more general meanings of *fortuna*, along with *felicitas*, he treats '*fortuna-tyche*', the Hellenistic *τύχη*, in reference to individuals, e.g. Scipio Africanus and Aemilius Paulus. But in interpreting events, as he shows in discussing the Alexander excursus (ix. 17 ff.), Livy will subordinate *fortuna* to *virtus* and *consilium*. This work is all carefully done, and Kajanto combines detailed analysis with mature judgement of the main issues.

Clare College, Cambridge

A. H. McDONALD

## SENECA'S DIALOGUES

FRANCESCO GIANCOTTI: *Cronologia dei "Dialoghi" di Seneca*. Pp. 453. Turin: Loescher, 1957. Paper, L. 3,200.

DURING the last five years Giancotti has written two books and a whole series of articles on various aspects of Senecan biography and has made the



chronology of the extant works his special field. He has already published his views on the *Tragedies*, the *Ludus*, and the *De clementia*; now he has gone on to produce a full-scale study of the *Dialogues*. He limits himself for the sake of convenience to the useful though artificial canon of the ten *dialogi* found so named in the Ambrosian codex and does not include the *De beneficiis*, the *Naturales Quaestiones*, or the *Epistulae Morales* in his present scope.

In an attempt to fit Seneca's works into a chronological scheme scholars have used every method short of the geiger counter. The positing of a rapport between certain works and the political atmosphere of a particular time, the search for latent historical allusions, the tracing of an alleged philosophical, spiritual, literary, or stylistic evolution in the extant writings, all these approaches have been enthusiastically adopted by their respective exponents. But it is possible that some of the works suffered revision, editing or deferred publication; the existence of a dualism in Seneca's life and work would cut away the basis of chronological research; and sceptics, faced with such difficulties, might well abandon the subject as hopeless. Giancotti is well aware of the difficulties inherent in such a study and the shortcomings of any particular method. Consequently he eschews any preconceived approach and does not aim primarily at producing results; his object is to give a systematic account of the material on the subject, to expound and test the theories of previous scholars and to guide the reader through the evidence and arguments for the dating of each dialogue in turn.

Anyone who plunges into the jungle of Senecan chronology can expect to find little firm foothold amongst the tangle of *ex silentio* arguments, *a priori* hypotheses, and exquisite fallacies which flourish there. Certain evidence is so scanty that subjective judgements are unavoidable and probability must play an important role. Giancotti's standards of evidence are rather too high for such a subject and he is at times over-cautious and inclined to cavil; having no axe of his own to grind, he aims at blunting the edge of everyone else's axe and bludgeons rather than cuts his way through the mass of material. After expounding the subject so fully it is a pity that he has so often chosen to be negative or non-committal. Rightly challenging those who presume to date a dialogue to a particular year, he tends to go to the other extreme and is content with very wide dating *termini*. All he will say about the *Ad Marciam* is that it was written after A.D. 37: the most that he will venture with confidence for the *De constantia sapientis* is that it was composed between 41 and 63, a period almost coextensive with Seneca's creative lifetime; he would place the *De providentia* either in the early months of exile or the years of retirement, thus not committing himself on the crucial decision; on the dating of the *De otio*, normally thought to have been written either just before or during the period of retirement, he demands a complete suspension of judgement. While applauding his admirable caution, one feels that it is not always compatible with the subject. He curiously combines the negativist attitude of the sceptic with the enthusiasm of the chronological empire-builder and is content with a minimum of result after 453 pages of exhaustive argument.

Those who look for ingenious hypotheses or novel conclusions will be disappointed, for this is not an adventurous or an exciting book. It is precisely what it professes to be, a systematic exposition and revaluation of the material on the subject. The author expounds the views of others with fairness and understanding, thus sparing the reader the labour of constantly referring to the

original authorities, and has produced an excellent digest of the pertinent literature. His critical attitude could be a little more incisive, his argument more compact, but he has given us an interesting book and made an invaluable contribution to the subject of Senecan chronology.

Brasenose College, Oxford

L. D. REYNOLDS

## THE TEUBNER TACITUS

P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt. Post C. Halm-G. Andresen octauum edidit ERICVS KOESTERMANN. Tom. ii, fasc. 2: *Germania, Agricola, Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Cloth, DM. 5.

THE text of this edition follows closely that of the seventh Teubner edition, also edited by Koestermann and published in 1949; indeed the alterations to text and apparatus criticus are accommodated within the same pagination. But there are added in the present edition separate indexes to each of the three works, a preface (pp. v-xxv) and a bibliography (xxvi-xxxviii). The preface begins with a brief account of the discovery in the fifteenth century of the Carolingian Codex Hersfeldensis, from which all extant manuscripts of the *opera minora* descend. A feature of Hersfeldensis (of which we now possess a portion covering three-fifths of the *Agricola*) is that it has marginal and inter-linear insertions made by a ninth-century corrector (E m. 2 in Koestermann's apparatus). Koestermann agrees with most modern editors other than Till in believing that most (but not necessarily all) of the readings of m. 2 are derived from another codex or the archetype of Hersfeldensis, and are not emendations of the corrector himself. So now at 17. 9 Koestermann prints *subiit* (superscr. m. 2) without brackets; at 25. 3 he reads *hostili exercitu* (E m. 2) for *hostilis exercitus*, at 30. 14 *nunc* (E m. 2) for *iam* (Hedicke). Outside the portion of the *Agricola* covered by Hersfeldensis Koestermann makes only one important alteration, reading at 46. 20, as he did in the sixth, but not in the seventh edition, *obruit* (Haupt) against the unanimous manuscript testimony for *obruet*.

Discussing the manuscripts of the *Germania* in his preface Koestermann continues to reject, though in less cavalier fashion, the classification proposed by R. P. Robinson in his critical edition of 1935 (followed, with modifications, by Perret in his Budé edition of the *Germania*). In the text he now prefers at 4. 5 *tamquam* ('lect. suo iure tuetur Anderson') to *quamquam*; at 34. 11 (*Druso*) and 46 fin. (in *medium relinquam*) he reverts to the manuscript reading.

None of Koestermann's alterations in the *Dialogus* breaks new ground. At 10. 23 (*adeptus*—formerly *adept(ur)us* Acidalius), 11. 10 (*in Nerone*—formerly *im(perante) Nerone* L. Müller), 28. 18 (*eliegebatur autem*—formerly *aut eliegebatur* Meiser) he returns to the manuscript reading; at 18. 23 (*Atticus Ursinus: antiquus codd.*) and 32. 31 (*non rhetorum <officinis>, sed Academiae spatii* suppl. Haase ex Cic. or. 12) he accepts emendations strongly supported by Güngerich (*Gnomon*, xxiii (1951), 47-48) in a review of Koestermann's previous edition of the *opera minora*.

University of Leeds

R. H. MARTIN

AUGUSTINE'S *CITY OF GOD*

Augustine: *City of God*. Edited with an English translation by G. E. McCracken. (Loeb Classical Library.) Vol. i (Books i-iii). Pp. xc+400. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.

If the Loeb Library is to find room for Christian authors at all, the *City of God* has an outstanding claim to a place in it, formidable as the undertaking is. The present volume, the first of seven, contains the general introduction and the text and translation of Books i-iii.

Professor McCracken's translation is less lively than Healey's, but more precise; and he is both more accurate and less pedestrian than Marcus Dods. He has evidently aimed at keeping as close to the Latin as is compatible with respectable English, even to the extent of following the sentence-construction and making the periods coincide where possible. Thus a Latin sentence of twelve lines on p. 206 is translated by a single English sentence, while eighteen lines in two sentences on p. 210 are similarly matched. A glance at the two passages from Books i-iii translated by R. H. Barrow in his *Introduction to St. Augustine* at once discovers a more lively style than McCracken's straight-jacketing allows. Still, he is far from being unreadable, and his plain rendering will serve the purpose for which many use the Loeb library, namely, to keep their classics going.

The text is substantially Dombart's as revised by Kalb, the fourth Teubner edition of 1928-9. Though one does not expect an apparatus criticus or an elaborate textual dissertation in this series, it seems fair to ask for something less meagre about the authorities. 'The text of the work is sound; whenever we have departed from it, that fact has been noted in the apparatus.' This comment on Dombart-Kalb is all we get in the introduction, and when we go on to the text, we find less than twenty critical notes. The first takes the unscholarly form: '*numina, omina, omnia, demonia*, various MSS.', and most of the rest are similarly vague. One, it is true, mentions two manuscripts by name and date, while two others refer to *sigla* nowhere explained. If the text is sound, this is not due to any immaculacy in the manuscripts but to editorial labours, and there is this additional reason for some explanation of the situation, that the oldest and best manuscripts cover only part of the work. Thus the reader should be informed that the sixth-century Lyons codex, the oldest of all, is available for the present books, though sadly mutilated, and is the L of p. 244, but will end with Book v. Let volume ii have a textual note—better late than never.

The introduction covers 75 pages, two-thirds devoted to a straightforward account of St. Augustine's life and writings, the rest to the *City of God*. These proportions might have been reversed with advantage, for the second part, while it gives an excellent explanation of the origin of the book, disclaims any evaluation of its thought and significance. This is a pity, and we shall hope for a separate introduction at least to Book xix.

Comment may be made on a few points of detail. In the introduction (p. xxvi), it is questionable whether Ep. 22 shows Augustine on terms of equality with Aurelius of Carthage, whose person and position he greatly respected (*pro tua praestantia et mea obsecundatione* is here sincere); p. xxviii, for 'priests' read 'bishops'; the description of Hippo (xxix) might mention the present excavations; the theoretical importance and widespread influence of Augustine's

anti-Donatist theology is underestimated (xli); p. xlv glides over the blunders of Pope Zosimus; and to say that Augustine refutes Tyconius in *De Doctrina Christiana* obscures his partial approval. The bibliographical note omits Barrow's valuable introduction to the *City of God* and Baynes's *Political Ideas of St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei*, small but good.

As the text is not new, it need not be discussed. In the translation one notices a tendency to overdo the search after absolute precision by supplying or repeating subjects and objects not expressed in the Latin, or there only as pronouns. For example, p. 137, 'the pilgrim city . . . the city', p. 138, 'inimicis . . . illis, enemies . . . enemies'; on p. 254 'the state' (once) and 'the gods' (twice) are additions, and on p. 359, 'alliance' is twice inserted. Sometimes this is helpful, even necessary, but as a habit it contributes to some stiffness of style. On p. 41, *male dissimulatur* is heavily turned into 'we hypocritically fail in our duty'. But these are trivialities, and closeness to the text has its own value. *Antiquos* on p. 284 is not translated, and on p. 323, twelfth line up, there is a redundant 'not'.

The footnotes, which of course do not purport to provide a commentary, are mostly references. However, room is found to explain many historical allusions. Perhaps Augustine's biblical citations might be further explained, at any rate when there is something unusual in the text. On p. 46 McCracken reads *omnia cooperatur* in Romans viii. 28, and translates it 'all things work together'. Does this mean that he takes it as a Graecism copying *panta sunergei*, and not as 'God works', a common and defensible variant? If so, how is the Greekless reader to understand this without a note? A page earlier, in Ezekiel xxxiii. 6, Augustine's variant is probably only a memory of the *morietur* so frequent in similar passages in Ezekiel, and the appended note is rather obscure. Surely Augustine uses *speculatores* because his biblical text has it, and if he wanted to impress any etymology on his readers, McCracken could continue the good work with a little more elucidation of *episkopein*.

Let it be said in conclusion that the points of criticism made in this review do not go very deep and are mostly offered in case they may have any bearing on later volumes. They are not intended to cast any doubt on the general trustworthiness of a very useful piece of work.

Selwyn College, Cambridge

S. L. GREENSLADE

## CERES, AMOR, BROMIUS

TÖNNES KLEBERG: *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine. Études historiques et philologiques.* (Bibliotheca Ekmaniana 61.) Pp. xi+163; 21 plates, map. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1957. Paper, Kr. 20.

MUCH can be learned about a people from its eating and drinking habits, and the conclusions reached in this book, which is expanded from a Swedish doctoral dissertation published in 1934, modest though they are (the author's own words), hold considerable interest for the student of ancient social and economic history. The general reader too can form from this study a clearer idea of what Roman inns and eating-houses were like, though nothing can replace the contemporary genre picture drawn by an Erasmus<sup>1</sup> or a Surtees.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Colloquia*, sub tit. *Diversoria*.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. *Facey Romford*, ch. 59, *Sponge*, ch. 67. I purposely prefer Surtees to Dickens,

whose inns tend to be idealized (though only he could have done the refreshment room at Mugby Junction).



Of the tavern as a centre of good-fellowship, the tavern of which the Archpoet wrote *mihi sapit dulcius uinum in taberna / quam quod aqua miscuit praesulis pincerna*, Latin literature, apart from the *Copa*, tells us little. How much the ancients took for granted of which we should welcome detailed descriptions! If only the novel had been invented earlier!

The difficulties which face an investigator in this field are obvious. The literary and inscriptional evidence, so far as it goes, is reasonably plentiful; but it is capricious in its silences and extends over some six centuries. Archaeology, on the other hand, offers a wealth of information for a single place at a single moment of time, Pompeii at the instant of its destruction (a city originally Greek, be it noted: and its inhabitants evidently preferred Greek wines (p. 142, n. 17). Should not this point be stressed?); in the absence of published material Kleberg makes little use of Herculaneum, but Ostia affords some, incomplete, evidence for an interesting comparison, to which I shall refer presently; otherwise the archaeological evidence is scanty.

A good many of the facts painstakingly established here are such as to occasion no surprise. These establishments are found at Pompeii where we should expect them, near the city gates, the baths, the places of entertainment, and in the business quarter; they are scarce in the better-class residential parts. They were chiefly patronized by the poor and the status of their employees was low: many innkeepers were of non-Roman origin (not that any of this need prevent a Roman gentleman profiting from the demand, as Kleberg reminds us: Varro advised proprietors whose estates bordered a highway to build inns on it). Many of these places were little better than brothels, and the hostesses and maidservants were frequently of a type familiar to readers of Shakespeare and Smollett. Water too often found its way into the wine before it arrived at the table (a bad habit reflected in the use of *κάπηλος*, *καπηλεύω*, *caupo*, *cauponor* in translations of Scripture: see Kleberg's interesting remarks at pp. 4 ff., 112 f.). In addition Kleberg has amassed much fascinating detail on less familiar topics such as inn-names and signs, internal arrangements and equipment, facilities (or the lack of them: compare *C.I.L.* xii. 5732 (p. 119) with the waggoner's complaint in *1 Henry IV*, ii. i. 19), decorations and so on. The discussion of 'Terminologie de l'activité hôtelière romaine' which takes up the first of his four chapters stands somewhat apart from the rest of the work, being a contribution rather to lexicography; it is based on the material, published and unpublished, of the *Thes. L.L.* It may come as something of a shock to those who, like the present writer, have visited Pompeii and prattle glibly of its *thermopolion* (being encouraged thereto by the official guidebook) to learn how slender are the pretensions of this word to genuine latinity (pp. 24-25).

The most important of Kleberg's conclusions are based on a close study and comparison of Pompeii and Ostia. In Pompeii he identifies twenty hotels proper (*hospitia* and *stabula*) and 118 eating-houses or taverns (*popinae*, *tabernae*); incidentally, would it not be instructive to calculate what proportion these figures represent of the total number of premises so far discovered which can be identified as shops? The most essential part of their equipment was evidently the stove for heating water; the literary evidence abundantly demonstrates the popularity of *negus*, and the poor of Pompeii had no cooking facilities in their miserable tenements (pp. 39, 104-5). At Ostia, on the other hand, which was extensively remodelled in the second century A.D., only two hotels and fourteen

taverns are identifiable, figures which, even allowing for the obliteration of identifying features through centuries of gradual decay and pillage, seem astonishingly small for a seaport. Kleberg (pp. 54-56, 101-7) connects this contrast with the puzzling imperial edicts against the sale of cooked food and hot water reported by Suetonius and Dio, which have been variously explained. Suetonius' suggestion that they were intended to restrain luxury will scarcely commend itself to anybody who has read Kleberg's treatise: as he remarks 'Le luxe que pouvaient étaler les estaminets de l'ancienne Rome n'a jamais, à ce qu'il semble, été particulièrement inquiétant' (p. 103). Dio saw them as police measures: the taverns were meeting-places for clubs and societies and formed centres of disaffection. This seems inherently more probable, but Kleberg suggests (pp. 101-7) that Suetonius was nevertheless essentially right, in that these measures were in fact social rather than political, and that we have in them evidence for an imperial programme of reform. These restrictions in the activities of taverns went hand in hand with improved housing (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15. 43), which included kitchens, and hygiene (*thermae*, with refreshments available), and distributions of food (raw materials, to be prepared at home). Ostia's scarcity of taverns then reflects in concrete fashion the result of these reforms at a somewhat later date. This thesis is advanced with exemplary caution, as the nature of the evidence for it demands. Certainly it seems more satisfying to explain these edicts as part of some sort of plan rather than to see in them merely 'des curiosités, rapportées par des chroniqueurs à l'affût du détail piquant' (p. 107).

The illustrations of Pompeian *tabernae* and their wall-paintings are printed on the same paper as the text and vary considerably in clarity. Kleberg's presentation is lucid and scholarly and his provision of bibliography, notes, and indexes seems all that could be desired.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

## MYCENAEAN STUDIES

*Études mycéniennes.* Actes du Colloque International sur les Textes Mycéniens, Gif-sur-Yvette, 3-7 avril 1956. (Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.) Pp. 280; 1 plate. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1956. Cloth, 2,000 fr.

In April 1956 the new branch of Mycenaean studies initiated by Michael Ventris achieved the distinction of being the subject of an international conference. Thanks to the enthusiasm and preparatory work of Professors Chantraine and Lejeune, supported by the resources of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, twenty scholars out of the twenty-four invited met in the Château de Gif-sur-Yvette for five days' discussion of the Linear B texts and their dialect.

The invitation to the Colloquium contained a request for papers to be submitted as a basis for discussion. Thirteen papers were received and distributed to members before the Colloquium. Considerably the largest part of *Études mycéniennes* consists of a reprint of these papers, together with a further three written shortly before the opening of the Colloquium and a bibliography,

compiled under Ventris's direction and issued in advance as part of *Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions and Dialect 1953-1955* by the London Institute of Classical Studies. The thirteen original papers were divided into two groups by the publication of Bennett's revised edition of the Pylos tablets; the consequences of the new material for M. S. Ruipérez's study of *ko-re-te-re*, *po-ro-ko-re-te-re* were serious enough to require an addendum to the original article, and illustrate again the precarious character of even the most penetrating and logical conclusions drawn from incomplete data. The recorded discussions of the Colloquium itself occupy a mere 63 pages out of almost 300. The volume opens with a summary account of the organization, membership, and daily proceedings of the Colloquium, and ends with six resolutions for the further conduct of Mycenaean studies and a table of contents, but regrettably no indexes of words or subjects.

The value of a conference to those who take part in it cannot easily be conveyed to non-participants. The description of *Études mycéniennes* given above will have suggested a certain disproportion between the preliminary studies and the record of the discussions. This would have had no significance if all the studies had been an integral part of the Colloquium. In fact, many of them treat points of detail or particular problems, and make (as far as can be seen from the published record) at most only an indirect contribution to the proceedings of the Colloquium itself; they would perhaps have been written even had there been no Colloquium in prospect, and could have been as well published in periodicals as in this volume. To say this is, of course, not to detract at all from their value as contributions to Mycenaean studies. They include, for example, Lejeune's thorough investigation of the content and expression of the Na, Ng, and Nn series of tablets, and that of Chantaine on the feminine agent-nouns attested in Mycenaean. Chadwick's paper on the signs for syllables beginning with sibilants, which advances from a careful muster of the evidence to an ingenious historical hypothesis, is likewise scarcely reflected in the discussions. The preliminary contributions differ widely, not only in their subjects, but in the methods of treatment which they exhibit. At one extreme are the bare lists of Ktistopoulos, of which Lejeune remarked that they need interpretation, and especially the elimination of purely coincidental phenomena—a task on which the Colloquium could well have spent a little time; it is, for example, of importance to know whether the number of sign-groups common to scripts A and B is too great to be the result of chance, and, if so, what linguistic and historical questions are raised thereby. At the other end of the scale stands Georgiev's thorough-going attempt to maintain that Linear B spelling rules, far from being inadequate, fairly closely represent phonetic peculiarities of the Mycenaean dialect. Of the other communications some have points of interest beyond their immediate purpose. For example, Mühlestein infers from the apparent phonetics of *ku-ru-so* 'golden' an interesting though precariously based modification of a view advanced formerly by Risch on the history of secondary sibilants in the Greek dialects. Bennett's study of the Aa, Ab, and Ad series of Pylos tablets introduces and employs a discipline now recognized as indispensable for the interpretation, both philological and linguistic, of the tablets—Mycenaean palaeography, and the study of the characteristic differences between the various scribal hands.

Of the discussions, those concerning bibliography and the further editing and indexing of the texts are notably business-like, thanks especially to the

clear ideas and great experience in these fields of Ventris and Bennett. Despite differences about the form which a Corpus of Linear B texts should take, the time at which it can be profitably undertaken, and other matters, the discussions of the future organization of Mycenaean studies led to a number of resolutions. Among these are detailed proposals for the long-term project of a Corpus; a statement of immediately needed instruments of research; proposals for co-operation in the bibliographical field and for a standing committee to promote the realization of the other proposals and in due course to convene a second international meeting. The other discussions, notwithstanding the excellent reports which introduce them and the skill of Lejeune as chairman in prompting debate and in summing it up, are inevitably at times rather desultory, though always interesting, reading. Vigorous controversy is lacking, but there are some dramatic moments; the best is perhaps the exchange between Bennett, Palmer, and Lejeune recorded on p. 261, in the course of which Lejeune's exclamation in answer to Bennett, 'Cette réponse fait sensation', is no exaggeration. The discussion on the dialectal character and position of Mycenaean Greek, in which this passage occurs, is one of the liveliest, yet even so it is disappointing to find so little direct debate between, say, Risch and Georgiev, who had expressed such divergent views in their preliminary communications on this subject, or between followers of the Porzig-Risch theory of Greek dialect relationships and supporters of the orthodox view.

However, it is obviously unfair to expect the same of a conference as of a scripted broadcast debate. The interest of this record of the Gif Colloquium lies in the fact that very many valuable things were said, if not always the things that one might have expected or wished most to hear; that the methods and in some degree the personalities of a number of leading scholars are confronted with each other and presented to us (for those who wish in imagination to see as well as listen to the debaters, there is a photograph of the company at the beginning of the volume); and that important recommendations are made for future work on the Linear B texts. The fulfilment of these projects will be awaited with impatience. The bibliographical undertaking, based on a scheme already in operation before the Colloquium, has borne fruit in further numbers of *Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions and Dialect* and in the regular bibliographical reports of *Minos*. Finally, gratitude is especially due to Lejeune—co-author and chairman of the Colloquium as well as editor of this record of it.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## SLAVES IN ATHENIAN SILVER MINES

SIEGFRIED LAUFFER: *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*. Zweiter Teil: *Gesellschaftliche Verhältnisse, Aufstände*. (Akad. der Wiss. in Mainz, Abh. der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Kl., 1956, Nr. 11.) Pp. 153. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1957. Paper, DM. 10.80.

THIS is the second and final part of a study of the slaves in the Attic silver mines, the first part of which was published in 1956 and reviewed in *C.R.* vii (1957), 241 ff. It deals with the general significance of these slaves for the social history of their time.

This part begins with a prosopographical study of the slaves, based almost



wholly on epigraphic evidence; there appear to be only two identifiable references by name to slaves from Laureion in the whole of ancient literature. The material is set out in two tables. The first, with fifty-three entries, contains the name, origin where known, probable date and source of information for all those who can with fair certainty be identified as mining slaves. The second contains information, similarly tabulated, about fifty-one other men and women, who can less certainly be so identified. The more important facts that emerge from these data are that considerably more than half the slaves are non-Greek, that these non-Greeks come mostly from the Thraceward district, Asia Minor, or other eastern regions, a high proportion from mining areas such as Thrace and Paphlagonia, and that the very great majority of the names recorded, whether on votive or on funerary inscriptions, belong to the fourth century B.C.

There follows a long and somewhat controversial section on the numbers and changes in numbers of these slaves. It starts with a warning signal, a table of the various estimates that have been made of these numbers by past scholars. For the fourth century they range from 5,000 (Beloch) to 60,000 (Boeckh). Lauffer has converging lines of attack on the problem. He begins with the direct literary evidence for the actual number of Laureion slaves. For the numbers before the occupation of Decelea he holds that Thucydides vii. 27. 5 supports a figure of 10,000 to 20,000, while Xenophon, *Vect.* iv. 24, suggests 20,000 to 30,000. For the period after Chaeronea he protests against the discard of Hyperides fr. 29, which speaks of more than 150,000 slaves from the silver mines and the rest of the land as possible recruits for the army. But he has to admit that the figure is almost certainly corrupt and to fall back on Beloch's conjecture, giving 50,000. He supposes, for no very convincing reason, that one-third of these came from the mines (i.e. about 15,000 to 20,000) and adds 10,000 to 15,000 for the non-combatant number, giving a total of 25,000 to 35,000. Perhaps we should be better advised to leave Hyperides out of the reckoning. For the numbers at the time of the first Sicilian slave war Diodorus xxxiv. 2. 19 mentions over 1,000 slaves as revolting in Attica, from which Lauffer deduces a total of 5,000 to 10,000 for Laureion slaves at that time.

The next line of attack is Ctesikles' 400,000 slaves at the time of Demetrius of Phalerum (*Fr. Gr. H.* 245 F 1). David Hume's attempt to save something from the absurd figure by supposing that the true number was 40,000 which had been 'augmented by a cipher' is gravely dismissed with the words 'was sich bei den griechischen Ziffersystemen schwer vorstellen lässt'. Lauffer, following a lead given by Beloch, conjectures that originally the figure read *MI*, that is ten myriads or 100,000 slaves in all; or, by applying his divisor of three, about 30,000 Laureion slaves. This again is rather sketchy and I seem to detect a vague suggestion, for example on pp. 148 and 152, that these recurring figures of about 30,000 are in some way mutually supporting, whereas they refer to widely separated periods of time and Lauffer himself insists on marked fluctuations during these years.

Turning to less direct evidence he wisely eschews a number of will-o'-the-wisps such as army strengths, citizen or ephebe lists, data on property or income, etc., but then, rather oddly, he follows one of the most delusive of them, the figures for corn consumption. I call it delusive because here too there is a wide divergence of dates. Thus the figure for corn imports is from about 355 B.C., that for home production from about 330, and that for the citizen and

metic population from 317/16. Moreover the figure for the average consumption per head is anything but safe. The resultant figure of 90,000 slaves in all, or (applying the divisor of three) of the familiar 30,000 Laureion slaves, is attributed in Table 10 to about the year 350 B.C.; but I cannot see why it should be put there rather than at any other date between 360 and 316.

Lauffer's last line of attack is through the lists of mining leases covering the period from 367/6 to about the end of the century. He endeavours to estimate from the lists the number of mines in operation at various dates; he assumes that there would have been roughly the same number of crushing-mills as of mines and that a mine would employ on the average 50, a mill 30-35 slaves; he discounts as insignificant in number slaves employed in smelting. This gives him total figures for various dates, the most significant being 4,000 to 5,000 about 367 B.C. and 35,000 about 340. These figures have the advantage that they are tied each to its own date, but Lauffer is right to emphasize that they are more trustworthy for the relative than for the absolute size of the slave population of the area.

The total picture which he derives from all these sources is set out in Table 11. For the fourth century it shows a gradual rise in the years between 400 and 367 from zero to about 5,000. Then a sensational rise to 20,000 about the year 355 and to 35,000 about the year 340. Then a decline to 20,000 at the end of the century. From the nature of the evidence I would suggest that the general shape of the curve is right, but the gradients may have been less steep. For the Hellenistic and Roman periods the evidence is more meagre, but it perhaps justifies Lauffer's contention that the decline in production from the beginning of the third century was neither so steep nor so continuous as is often asserted.

After some very useful material on the family life of the slaves, their earnings, their free time, and their cults we come to an important discussion of their *eranoi*. The very existence of these associations is a tribute to the liberal temper of Athens which has not always had the attention it merits. The precise scope of their activities is a matter of dispute. Lauffer holds that they were often more than purely temporary unions formed for some immediate and passing purpose, though rightly refusing to go with Kahrstedt in assigning to them juristic personality.<sup>1</sup>

The discussion of manumission, the freedman status, and the acquisition of citizenship is backed by another table with a list of 26 men, identified by their names as slaves, who had become citizens in the demes of the area. There must have been more whose names do not provide this means of identification. From these 26 enfranchised men Lauffer wishes to draw the important conclusion that, though as he has pointed out earlier the Laureion slaves formed a relatively isolated segment of the slave population, they were still not fundamentally separated in social standing and status from other slaves. Here there is some danger of circular argument. For we cannot be certain how many of these were mining rather than other kinds of slaves. Indeed on p. 211 he comes near to a *petitio principii* when he argues that owing to the relatively greater number of mining slaves in the area we may assume that a considerable number of miners will be found among the ex-slave members of the demes there.

Finally, there is a detailed account of the attempts to gain freedom, from the

<sup>1</sup> In discussing the part played by *eranoi* in manumissions he might have given a reference to M. I. Finley, *Land and Credit in*

*Ancient Athens*, pp. 104 ff., who comes to the conclusion that in these cases at least *eranoi* were purely *ad hoc* loan groups.

large-scale desertions during the Decelcan war to the revolts, properly so-called, at the end of the second century B.C.

There are several excellent indexes, including one of passages from ancient authors and inscriptions.

Merton College, Oxford

A. R. W. HARRISON

## DION

HELMUT BERVE: *Dion*. (Akad. der Wissenschaften in Mainz: Abh. der. geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 1956, Nr. 10.) Pp. 141. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1957. Paper, DM. 10.80.

PROFESSOR BERVE has given us an excellent account of Dion's career, balanced, readable, and based on a full and critical appraisal of the recent work done on the sources. As far as this goes he clearly believes that a point has now been reached from which we are not likely to advance much farther. Attempts to recover Theopompus' account have failed. Hammond's case for attributing the relevant chapters of Diodorus xvi to him has been generally rejected, and though both Westlake and Voit have detected Theopompus behind the hostile account of Dion as tyrant in the second half of Nepos' *Life*, Berve argues convincingly that this may just as well be from Timaeus, whose dislike of Dion and tyranny alike is well attested. Diodorus will probably go back to Ephorus, with some consultation of Timaeus (p. 16). As for Plutarch, Berve is inclined to accept Voit's argument that the *Dion* drew on a Hellenistic life, which gave the story something of its tragic colour; but he rightly insists, as did Voit himself (*Historia*, 1954-5, pp. 181 ff.), on Plutarch's independent consultation of a wide selection of earlier sources.

In the end therefore one finds oneself back at the Platonic account and its credibility (for as a bare minimum *Epist.* 7 and 8 can be taken as genuine). For a time it was popular to reject the traditional picture in favour of a cynical view of Dion as merely concerned to set himself up as tyrant in Dionysius' place, and actuated throughout by motives of ambition and revenge. This version, exemplified by Beloch, Berve rejects, and surely with justice. Plato, who had got to know Dion intimately in the decade between 366 and 357, cannot have had the whole story wrong. And though Thiel argued that, rightly interpreted, Plato is critical of Dion's career once he comes to its later phases, it is impossible (as Berve points out) to discount the eulogy on his glorious death in the *Seventh Epistle*, or the sentiments expressed in the epigram written when it became known. The natural conclusion is that Dion was a sincere follower of Plato, determined to carry out the programme of the Academy by setting up an ideal state at Syracuse, whether the citizens wanted it or not. In pursuit of that aim he was high-handed and doctrinaire, arrogant and aloof in his relations with his fellow men; and ultimately, as one group after another fell away from him, he found himself driven to use the methods of a tyrant.

In this course Dion adopted policies which proved irreconcilable with his aim, since they were in themselves tyrannical. But Berve is, I believe, right in attributing these compromises into which Dion was led, not to weaknesses in his character, but to the inevitable clash between the ideal he set up and the

real conditions within which he had to work; they reveal weakness only in so far as lack of realism is weakness. How far Dion justified his actions by reference to the teachings of the Academy, and what role Plato attributed to him are both vexed questions. That Plato envisaged Dion as the 'scientific statesman' of the *Politicus* seems on the whole improbable; but Dion may possibly have been encouraged by such teaching as that in *Polit.* 293 a-c, on the right of the statesman to banish and execute in the interest of the state, to justify giving way to his friends and quietly eliminating Heracleides, ultimately an act of *Staatsraison*. Berve (like Porter in his edition of Plutarch's *Dion*) argues that Plato has learnt a lesson from Dion's experience, when later on, in *Epist.* 7. 331 d, he adopts an uncompromising attitude against the use of political violence; this seems both probable and significant.

But in any case part of the responsibility for Dion's failure must rest on Plato. Teacher and pupil alike failed to realize the disadvantage under which Dion laboured from the outset (p. 133). As a relative of the tyrant, with a record of years of loyal service at the tyrant's court, he was singularly ill-suited for the introduction of a form of state which would inevitably inspire resentment, since it offered less freedom than had been available immediately after the liberation, and would equally inevitably be interpreted by the democrats as a resumption of tyranny. Sicily too (here Berve endorses Thiel's judgement) was of all places particularly ill-adapted to the Platonic experiment, because of its luxury, its long tradition of tyranny (with its consequent elimination of the middle class), and the chronic threat from Carthage, which could be effectively countered by a degree of centralization only attainable under some form of autocracy. But however much responsible Greeks might take seriously the political wisdom of the Academy, in essence the Platonic state was bound to fail (pp. 138-9), since it rested upon an over-optimistic belief that Utopias could be created by act of parliament.

To turn to details. Berve underlines both Dion's skilful tactics in his invasion of Sicily and the extent to which he was relying on Carthaginian help (a policy of realism in which he parted from Plato). According to Plutarch (who here goes back most likely to Timonides) Heracleides' expedition was virtually an independent venture, following upon a quarrel in the Peloponnese between Heracleides and Dion; but Thiel has shown how the two were tactically inter-linked, Dion's crossing over the high seas being designed to draw Philistus away from southern Italy and so open up the coastal route for Heracleides. This account, which fits Diodorus, is clearly preferable. Beloch, it may be added, took the same view, and made the further point that the whole expedition depended on Dion's finances.

Westlake, in his useful study in *Durham University Journal*, 1945-6, pp. 37-44, assumed that Dion was deposed at the regular elections of summer 356. Berve criticizes this view, arguing that the position of *strategos autocrator* must have been held, not for a year, but until the completion of the liberation. There seems no reason to think that this necessarily followed from the nature of the office. We do not even know whether Dionysius I was appointed to it for a definite number of years, or for life (cf. W. Hüttl, *Verfassungsgeschichte von Syrakus*, p. 101), but clearly Dion would not wish to invite comparison with the tyrant. It is at least possible that the term of office was left undefined, and that Porter is right when he says (*Plutarch's Dion*, p. 93): 'the Ecclesia chose to regard his tenure of office as expiring at midsummer, at the end of the legal



year.' In any case, Dion held this office in conjunction with Megacles, and perhaps a distinction should be drawn between this and the later appointment alone after Dion's return from Leontini. On the other hand, Berve has, I think, made a good case for accepting (against Westlake) Nepos' statement (*Dion*, 7. 2) that the upper classes were alienated from Dion when he had to turn to them for the maintenance of his mercenaries.

Dion's career remains one of the most striking illustrations within the field of ancient history of the extent to which any given political end lays limitations upon the means which can be employed to achieve it, and further of the extent to which the realities of political life and human nature themselves restrict the field of profitable action. The appropriate morals we can all draw for ourselves. Meanwhile we must be grateful to Berve for this stimulating essay.

*University of Liverpool*

F. W. WALBANK

## CRETAN POTTERY

J. K. BROCK: *Fortetsa*. (British School at Athens: Supplementary Paper no. 2.) Pp. xvii + 224; 174 numbered, 36 unnumbered plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. Cloth, £6. 16s. 6d. net.

THE tombs described here were opened near the village of Fortetsa by Cnossus in 1933 and 1935. Publication was delayed by the sudden deaths of the two excavators, the war, and the printers. Brock deserves only praise for completing the long and difficult task he took over.

The plan of his book, explained in the 'Note on Method', is convenient and logical. First, the tombs are examined generally. Then each is described and its contents catalogued, as far as practicable in order of date. Next comes the study of the pottery in five sections—a short survey, two detailed analyses by shapes and decorative patterns, an account of the technique, and a note on the imported pieces. Two more chapters take the objects of metal and those of terracotta and other materials. Finally, the chronology is discussed and historical conclusions considered. There is a useful index. The plates and drawings of patterns are as complete as could be wished.

The contents of the tombs are dated to the early Iron Age, from Sub-Minoan to Orientalizing. But some of the tombs themselves may be older. In shape they continue the Late Bronze Age tradition of Crete; that is they are small chambers cut out of the soft limestone, about 1 to 2½ metres across, and entered by a steep passage. But the rite is cremation. Each tomb was used several times, the earlier interments often being pushed aside or removed to the passage. This shifting and the frequent collapse of the ceilings made it difficult to determine the sequence of the burials. But Brock has set out the evidence honestly and in detail, and the caution of his judgements is exemplary.

Altogether these tombs contained about 1,300 pots, the most useful series yet known in Crete. Some of the smaller pieces were found inside larger; for the rest the chronology depends partly on position in the tomb, but more on style. Brock's classification is this—Sub-Minoan (1020-970 B.C.), Early Proto-geometric (970-920), Middle Proto-geometric (920-870), Late Proto-geometric (870-850), Proto-geometric B (850-820), Early Geometric (820-800), Mature Geometric (800-770), Late Geometric (770-735), Early Orientalizing (735-

680), Late Orientalizing (680-630). This classification brings a new precision to the study of Cretan pottery. Most noteworthy is the placing of what Brock calls 'Protogeometric B', a name not only clumsy but unhappy, since the character of this style is (as Brock says) 'Proto-Orientalizing' and indeed earlier students regarded it as transitional from Geometric to Orientalizing. For the Orientalizing style Brock would have liked a tripartite arrangement, had the material from Fortetsa been sufficient. Though some of the divisions may be too fine, this classification is generally convincing and, in spite of local variations, I think it can be applied to finds from other parts of Crete.

The character of this Cretan pottery is eccentric, but provincial. The Sub-Minoan lasts well into the period when Protogeometric was flourishing elsewhere. The Cretan Protogeometric which follows owes more to Sub-Minoan than to contemporary styles in Greece, even retaining the stirrup vase. Protogeometric B is surprising in its new motives, such as hooks, spirals, and cables. Brock's suggestion that they were inspired by Oriental metal work does not explain why they are so simple. The Geometric style is fairly orthodox and maintains itself for a time against its Orientalizing successor. In general Cretan vase-painters, though liking variety in decorative detail, remained petty and unambitious. As Brock says, it is hard to see Crete as the preceptor of Protocorinthian: connexions were rather the other way.

The chronology depends on imported pieces. For Sub-Minoan and earlier Protogeometric these give close relative dates. But it is less easy to fix Protogeometric B and Geometric, since the imports are of long-lived types, and I think that Brock's dates may still be too high. His choice of 735 B.C. for the beginning of Orientalizing puzzles me more: according to the general chronology he seems to accept that the Corinthian Orientalizing style begins about 725 B.C., but I do not believe that Brock means to give priority to Crete.

Not much need be said about the other finds. The most interesting are a girdle and a quiver, both of bronze and decorated in relief: as on other Cretan reliefs of that time the Oriental style is not well assimilated. It may also be mentioned that at Cnossus too the burial of weapons was rare after the Geometric period. Less than four pages are given to general conclusions. These are properly cautious. Even so, the change from inhumation to cremation may be no more important than it was at Athens.

Brock has done his work admirably. For students of Greek pottery this is an important and standard work. The illustrations are clean and adequate, though G. M. Young's photographs have lost something in reproduction. The price is reasonable.

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

R. M. COOK

## AMAZONS

DIETRICH VON BOTHMER: *Amazons in Greek Art*. (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology.) Pp. xxvii + 252; 90 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, £8. 8s. net.

THIS book records more than 1,300 Greek representations of Amazons from the early seventh to the late fifth century B.C. They are arranged by date and type. First come early Amazons, few and varied. The next four chapters, on

Attic black-figure, take Amazons of the second quarter of the sixth century and then later Amazons fighting Heracles, fighting other enemies, or not fighting. There follow the few black-figure Amazons of 'Chalcidian', the related Polyphemus group, Boeotian, and Laconian. Chapter vii has the Amazons of Archaic and Early Classical sculpture. Next is the abduction of Antiope in sculpture and vase-painting. Two chapters collect the remaining Amazons of Attic red-figure. Lastly, the earlier Classical sculptures are assembled. There are appended a concordance with Corey's *de Amazonum antiquissimis figuris* of 1891, an index of inscribed names of Amazons and their opponents or allies, and an index by collections.

The text consists of lists of these Amazons, methodically classified and sub-classified, and interspersed with comments (mostly descriptive) on particular pieces. A few comments are of wider interest, as for instance on 'Chalcidian' (pp. 111-14) and the Athenian Treasury at Delphi (pp. 117-19). But there is no attempt to draw conclusions of general relevance to the history of Greek art or legend, perhaps because no such conclusions can be drawn both usefully and honestly. Though the author's industry, observation, and learning are beyond question, I cannot see why his study was published. This is no censure of von Bothmer, who rather deserves sympathy. He was advised as a student for an archaeological doctorate to investigate Amazons, he doggedly completed and extended his task, and when he had a chance to publish naturally he took it. Detailed studies of single topics of Greek art are becoming too common: they may make good training for advanced students, but rarely give much enlightenment to anyone else. I doubt if many libraries, even of universities, will need this expensive work.

The style (manner of Beazley) is concise and occasionally coloured, though I fear that the 'mancet' of p. 11 is a misprint. The proof-reading is excellent. The plates, of moderate quality, offer a convenient repertory and many unpublished views of pots. The production of the book is handsome.

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

R. M. COOK

## ANCIENT ARCHITECTURE

HUGH PLOMMER: *Ancient and Classical Architecture*. (Simpson's *History of Architectural Development*, vol. i.) Pp. xxii+384; 24 plates, 121 line-drawings. London: Longmans, 1956. Cloth, 35s. net.

For sixty years Simpson's *History*, a work notable for its clarity and balanced judgement, has been a valued handbook for generations of students. Now that so many fresh archaeological discoveries of the utmost significance, not only in Greece and Italy but especially in Crete, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor, have made drastic revision essential, the first section, dealing with Ancient and Classical Architecture, has been entirely rewritten by Dr. Plommer. This task of analysing the structural achievements of three thousand years and co-ordinating the results of the latest research in a single volume might have defeated a less enthusiastic and determined scholar, and if at times the author seems to be cramming the contents of a pantechicon into a Gladstone bag he has, in the main, succeeded in reducing the immense mass of complicated material to manageable form with a minimum sacrifice of clarity to comprehensiveness.

The book is written primarily for those, such as many architectural students, who do not possess a knowledge of classical languages or of ancient history and the author has therefore taken pains to outline the historical and political background in a general introduction and to explain throughout the book the significance of the buildings in relation to the social conditions of the time. Nevertheless, it also provides a valuable introduction to the subject for those reading Classics or Classical Archaeology and indeed for any person who wishes to explore this rewarding field of study.

It is always difficult to describe architectural forms and methods in words and a book of this kind can never provide as many illustrations as might be desired, but the reader can, if necessary, make good the deficiency by using the copious references provided. There is no comprehensive bibliography, but those works and transactions most important for reference are separately listed and a large number of footnotes are inserted so as to enable students to follow up a subject.

The volume is divided into three sections: Architecture before Greece, Greece, and Architecture after Greece, the various phases being interrelated wherever possible and not presented as isolated phenomena. In the chapters dealing with Egyptian and other pre-Hellenic architecture in Mesopotamia, the Aegean, and Asia Minor, the student is given in condensed form a great deal of information which, while necessary for a proper understanding of later developments, could otherwise only be obtained by consulting a number of specialized works.

Plommer rightly devotes much space to the form and development of the Greek Orders but here his exposition is sometimes hard to follow. For example, in relation to the crucial problem of the angle tryglyph in the Doric Frieze, a subject clearly explained by Robertson and by Lawrence, the following statement on page 185 concerning Western Greek types of the sixth century B.C.—‘Critics can bring against their buildings the absence of angle contraction, achieved by setting the architrave back from the front faces of the abaci and thus disproportionately enlarging the latter until they almost touch’—seems particularly obscure.

As Plommer is a classical scholar rather than an architect, it is possible that some of the terminology employed may be a little confusing to those unfamiliar with ancient languages. The inclusion of a clear plan of one major Greek temple and a large-scale section of an Order would have enabled those previously unacquainted with the subject to understand the structural forms and the niceties of design more easily than many diagrams inserted to explain small points of detail. In this section, moreover, it may be thought that the treatment of the Ionic order is inadequate and the value of the work as a general survey seems slightly diminished when a building of the importance of the Erechtheum is dismissed as ‘sufficiently described by Robertson and Dinsmoor’.

It is especially commendable that Plommer fills in the gap between Greek and Roman architecture by devoting proportionate attention to the Hellenistic Period from 322 to 31 B.C., so unaccountably neglected by many previous writers who have largely ignored the highly significant and widely dispersed examples of this age of extension and experiment. How right he is in this connexion to emphasize the importance of Pompeii, describing its houses of the second century as the first great architectural achievement of Italy and saying:



'it has been the fashion lately to belittle Pompeii. But where in our own civilisation can we find small provincial towns as elegant as the Pompeii of the Tufa Period?'

The chapters dealing with Roman architecture are perhaps the best. For many years past the achievements of Rome in the fields of civic planning and architecture have been consistently underrated and it is therefore particularly encouraging to read Plommer's enthusiastic appreciation of these works and his emphasis on the lessons to be learned from the Grand Roman manner of building. He is, however, by no means uncritical in matters of detail and, as a purist, disapproves strongly of the Ionic capital with four diagonal volutes (page 306) though this might well be regarded as a rational solution of the problem posed by the angle capital, since the earlier Greek expedient of an angle volute splayed out at  $45^\circ$  never seems wholly satisfactory. He renews the attack on page 309 when describing the 'yet more barbarous Composite Capital', saying that the lower acanthus leaves of the Corinthian capital were crowned with the diagonally voluted Ionic capital and that in the great Baths of Rome in the third century the volutes grew vertically from the echinus instead of being linked by a canal. 'This', he says, 'is the true Roman composite, and it is this that probably misled Renaissance blunderers like Inigo Jones into designing Ionic capitals with vertical volutes diagonal in plan.' Unfortunately this is not in accordance with the facts. In no Composite capital in Rome do the volutes grow vertically from the echinus, though sometimes drawn in this way; they are always linked horizontally by an upper fillet, except in those of the Arch of Titus, the earliest known example of this Order. Moreover, among 'Renaissance blunderers' Scamozzi, if anyone, should take the blame.

In emphasizing the skill displayed in Roman construction in Italy, Plommer is perhaps inclined to underestimate the importance of certain later structural developments in other parts of the Empire. In particular, the domed stone buildings of Syria in the second or third centuries are overlooked, although it was here and not in Rome that the problem of relating a circular dome to a square plan seems first to have been satisfactorily solved.

A few small textual errors and inconsistencies should be corrected in a future edition. On page 28 the author points out that 'pylon' means a doorway and not the flanking towers, but this is contradicted by the title 'Pylons at Edfou' in plate 2. In footnote 2 on page 31 'western' should read 'eastern'; on page, 258, 'pl. 7' should be 'pl. 17' and on page 308 'pl. 21' should read 'pl. 15'. On page 146 'credibility' appears to mean 'credulity'.

This work is more than a textbook; Plommer sets out to extol the virtues of Classical Architecture and to remind the present generation of the enduring lessons it still can teach in order, beauty, and magnificence. In this campaign he is often provocative but the book is none the worse for that and even if the reader does not always agree he will at least be made to think.

*Farm Hall, Godmanchester, Huntingdon*

MARSHALL SISSON

## GREEK ARCHITECTURE

A. W. LAWRENCE: *Greek Architecture*. (The Pelican History of Art.) Pp. xxxiv+327; 152 plates, 171 figs. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1957. Cloth, 63s. net.

GREEK architecture needs today a sympathetic champion who will show the thought that went to its creation, and will reveal its fundamental architectural virtues to an age ignorant enough to doubt their existence and foolish enough to exclude the intellect from art. One would have hoped that the distinguished author of this outwardly handsome book, produced as one of a 'popular' series, might see the need to recall us, before it was too late, to that classical urbanity and good taste which we have now again almost entirely lost.

The illustrations, indeed, are attractive at first sight, though rather lacking in architectural meat. The production seems fairly careful. I have found only one figure—137—wrongly labelled (it shows not Olynthus but Larisa). But Lawrence seems strangely reluctant to argue about properly architectural topics.

He does not consider, for instance, why certain temples, alone among Greek buildings, could be completely surrounded by columns, why the exteriors of stoas are normally Doric, or why Greek towns mostly lacked the strongly axial plans of Roman. He nowhere tells us why he heads the first part of his book 'Pre-Hellenic Building', the second 'Hellenic Architecture'. On p. 111, the place where he comes nearest to an aesthetic of the Doric Order, he writes that its parts 'must be so shaped as to keep the spectator's eye continually on the move. Every part must be rightly proportioned in itself as well as in relation to the rest, but none may attract more attention than another. Each line points towards one which turns at a different angle and obliges the eye to follow it; some lines, moreover, ought to be so constructed as to lead in either direction simultaneously.' This linear theory seems an inadequate rationale of the Classical Manner. How, for Lawrence, is a part 'rightly proportioned'? What of the simplicity in the shapes of the different parts, what of the satisfaction given to the spectator by their real and apparent stability, or his repose (akin to that given by a musical resolution), once he comprehends the simple mathematical relations between a whole design and its details? Not for Lawrence an analysis of Doric on the principles of Alberti and Geoffrey Scott. He thinks he has shown the Greeks to be savages, and so primitive that (p. 230) the larger blocks of stone on their buildings were raised into position, as at Stonehenge, up ramps of earth. He thus defies all the evidence for Greek ropes, tongs, lewises, and pulleys collected by nearly all his precursors.

Nor does he mention the constantly recurring shapes in Greek buildings. Despite p. 103, the abacus and echinus of Doric columns are usually of nearly equal height, and differ at most by the height of the three annulets (cf. Wilberg in *J.O.L.*, 1919, pp. 170-1). He says on p. 143 that the roof of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi is pitched very low, giving a squat effect. Its pitch (just over 14°) is fairly normal. It looks squat only because it cannot rise as high over a façade of three bays as over the normal temple façade of five bays. Over the latter the height of the tympanum often equals the combined height of frieze and architrave—a restful proportion nowhere noticed by Lawrence. One of the most important innovations between Greek and Roman times was

the introduction of the pilaster. Lawrence does not discuss this change. On p. 276 he describes as 'pilasters' the antae at the corners of the Bouleuterion of Miletus. Those of the Propylon there are actually much more like real pilasters (see *Milet*, i. 2, Taf. xi). But they are still antae, not pilasters like those in the early houses of Pompeii.

With his infrequent attention to classical forms, Lawrence can at times deny the classical search for correctness. For him the words 'correct taste' are priggish, and represent a Renaissance, not a classical mentality (p. 84). Of course, he has against him Vitruvius i. 3. 2, iii. 1. 1, 3. 6, iv. 3. 12, vi. 3. 5, 3. 11, vii praef. 14, etc. In many cases, Vitruvius derives the visual correctness, in the 'Renaissance' manner, from simple mathematical ratios. Lawrence cannot always maintain his pose; and on the last page of his Epilogue he writes: 'Beauty . . . implied . . . something analogous to the right thing; a building could not be beautiful unless it conformed with the long-established and universally admitted dogmas of the art, as well as having—and this ranked above all other qualities—correct proportions to the smallest detail.' But again (p. 169) the near-perfection of buildings on the Acropolis is actually 'equivalent' to the limitation of their architects' ambitions. But why and how were these limited? Lawrence does not tell us; but perhaps we may catch a hint from Aristotle, *Ethics*, 1106<sup>a</sup> ff. Lawrence has not thought out his own position.

Nor does he even analyse the 'long-established dogmas'. He leaves many to be inferred from the buildings themselves; and he goes astray, for instance, in explaining the thickening of the architrave from its front to its rear face between the sixth and fifth centuries. He says on p. 106 that it was thickened to support the new marble roof-tiles, so much heavier than the clay tiles of the sixth century. But (1) marble roof-tiles were invented in the earlier sixth century (Pausanias v. 10. 3; cf. Dinsmoor, *Greek Architecture*, p. 72), but were not the rule even in the fifth. (2) Why was not the cornice thickened in proportion, seeing that it had now to take the full weight of a marble roof-edging? That it was not, we can see from Lawrence's own Plate 21. (3) The thin architrave of the sixth century enabled the angle triglyph to be placed on the corner and yet over the axis of the corner-column. But it entailed an abacus intolerably wide in proportion. The abaci in some early temples nearly touch. The fifth century preferred a relatively deeper architrave and angle contraction.

Lawrence does attempt to derive the Doric Order from primitive construction. Unlike Viollet-le-Duc, he is sure on p. 84 that its forms originated in timber. But (1) he does not mention that the earliest known Doric cornice, at Calydon, had coffers, not pegged mutules. (2) He does not sufficiently distinguish between the early Doric of the Mainland (c. 600 B.C.) and the merely provincial Doric of Sicily, perhaps fifty years later. Dinsmoor makes the latter a contemporary of mid-century Ionic; and Sicilian temple-roofs merely garble primitive but logical roofs like that on the Temple of Artemis, Corcyra. Nor does the Temple of Apollo at Syracuse, whether early or not, now afford evidence for single oblong metopes between the pairs of columns, as Lawrence still thinks (p. 120). See G. Cultrera in *Monumenti Antichi*, 1951. Lawrence cites this article, but has not read it. For on p. 121 he says that we cannot recover the plan of the cella in this temple; and Cultrera has in fact recovered it. Similarly, Lawrence makes Foce del Sele and its tapering triglyphs too early and too important. (3) He describes canonical Doric with insufficient care. P. 104, note 3 says strange things about the architraves of non-peripteral

temples. P. 107 implies that the raking cornice had mutules. On Fig. 59 ridge-tiles are called 'antefixes' (fixed in front of what?) and the raking sima 'slanting cornice'. (4) He supposes that the triglyph originated in a row of three contiguous posts, each an octagon on plan. But why, especially under a protective cornice, had these to be given the elaborate collective capital always to be found on stone triglyphs? (Conversely, if, as Rhomaïos believes—*Eph. Arch.*, 1952, p. 24—they began as three separate Doric columns, touching only at their abaci, why in stone are they always three contiguous octagonal posts?) The guttae, says p. 104, represent pegs driven into the bottom of these posts. Crookedly, seeing that these posts stood inside the front plane of the architrave? And why not three guttae, instead of the canonical but awkward six, or the four or five found on some early works? The origins of Doric remain a great mystery, and Lawrence at least has collected little to illuminate them.

For the rest, this book seems to lack a thread. It makes valuable remarks at times. P. 55 notes an interesting early case of concentric town-walls. P. 101 makes some good and possibly correct guesses about the construction of columns. P. 306 suggests, perhaps correctly, that Palatitsa was a palaestra. Fig. 82 is not badly chosen. But occasional acuteness is no substitute for sustained argument.

Lawrence includes the Bronze Age not for its relevance to Classical Greek art (he hardly faces this admittedly difficult question), but because scholars would be glad to have the material tidily collected. Has he collected it tidily?

The bibliography omits Bell's unpretentious but useful book. P. 21 is rather summary on the word 'tholos', which this reviewer is loth to apply to beehive tombs. Nor, despite p. 21, are convex lintels common in Mycenaean work. On p. 23, Alalakh should have been considered for its prototype of the Minoan Palace Court. P. 24 quotes St. John most inappropriately. What Asiatic parallels does p. 25 envisage to the magazines of Cnossus? Boghaz-Koi? P. 34, which considers the possible Minoan prototypes of classical entablatures, should have mentioned the Caravanserai at Cnossus (cf. Demangel, *Frise Ionique*, pp. 96 ff.). P. 34 seems to be comparing the Egyptian houses of Amarna with asymmetrical Minoan houses. They are not strictly contemporary, and many (e.g. that of the Vizier Nekht) are less rambling designs than one might gather from p. 34. Despite p. 50, the 'Temple Tomb' is less obviously adapted from a Cretan residence than from an Egyptian tomb (cf. Persson, *New Tombs at Dendra*, p. 166). P. 50 ignores the great difference in scale between the baffling tomb at Isopata and the hypogea of Ras Shamra. P. 59 says that the Treasury of Atreus is held up on the cantilever system. But I know no evidence of a counterpoise; and without that no cantilever can work. The building is stable, because its courses form horizontal arches. Despite Lawrence, its door-jambs do not slope inwards in imitation of Egyptian work. Egyptian doors usually have vertical sides. They may be set in a backward-sloping façade, as at Abu Simbel. But the façade of Atreus is vertical. P. 63 (written before September 1955) alludes to the one 'tholos' found intact, but does not tell us this was at Dendra. P. 64 derives the relieving device at Menidi from Egypt, and calls it 'less effective' than the normal relieving triangle. In Egypt it is found inside Old Kingdom pyramids, where late Mycenaeans could hardly see it, but where it can effectively hold up even 340 feet of superincumbent masonry (Perrot and Chipiez, i. 221-2). Why say on p. 68 that the Bronze Age megaron was 'always entered from the south', when it was entered from the west at Mycenae? P. 68 does not correctly envisage the Egyptian clerestory system.



For on this the megaron at Tiryns would have not a central lantern, but raised outer walls with a clerestory and a wide ceiling supported near its centre by the four columns. Lawrence produces no evidence for his dating (1350 B.C.) of the *enceinte* at Tiryns. But by this time one has ceased to expect that patience and care which alone could make his collection of Bronze Age material truly comprehensive and accurate.

I have no space to prolong this examination over the remaining 250 pages. One can notice only a few points. P. 86 calls the Corinthian capital 'undignified'. Alas! for Castle Howard and the York Assembly Rooms. The same page, by implication, and the more dogmatic pages 199-200 expressly condemn the Treasury of Cyrene because it was a mathematical exercise. Pp. 107-8 derive all their evidence for Greek roof-carpentry from Fiechter's view of Aegina, which p. 144 discredits. (P. 137 calls the roof on the Tower of the Winds 'antiquated'; but I think myself that it is one of the more advanced Greek roofs.) P. 131 considers the square Ionic abacus 'perfectly logical' for stone. But is any abacus logical in Ionic? Lawrence omits the Ionic 'Parthenon' at Neapolis. He can therefore say later (p. 211) that Hellenistic Macedonia has few Ionic façades, because the Order had not long been introduced there. P. 149 follows and garbles Dinsmoor for the dimensions of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, and ignores Pausanias. All asymmetries on the Acropolis Lawrence of course attributes to the original designers. One must protest strongly against such dogmatism. On pp. 166-7 the north door of the Erechtheum is depicted with its later infilling, and described without it. Compare p. 260, where Philo's Arsenal has piers in the picture, columns in the text. P. 179 credits the Periclean architect with the present plan of Sunium. But Dörpfeld showed, in *A.M.*, 1884, Taf. 15, that it virtually repeats that of the archaic temple. Lawrence's theory for Sunium, that fewer flutes increase the apparent width of a column, appears to contradict Vitruvius iv. 4. 2. Despite p. 185, cauliculi belong in nature not to the acanthus but to umbellifers. See Meurer in *J.d.I.*, 1896, pp. 142 ff.

Lawrence's philology and history are not always exact. 'Curvilinear masonry has been called Lesbian from its prevalence in the fortifications of Lesbos' (p. 225). No! Aristotle gave it its name in *Ethics* 1137<sup>b</sup>. On p. 175 Lawrence is obviously unaware that the temple which Verres straightened was not in Sicily but that of Castor in Rome. No wonder that Cicero could 'repeat the story', as Lawrence rather unfairly puts it, 'without a word of explanation even to a Roman audience'!

The illustrations on pp. xxiii-xxxi, intended for beginners, are not, I think, to be debited to Lawrence. Many of their errors (e.g. their cigar-shaped columns) are tacitly corrected in the text. They are, indeed, below the standard of the book.

## SHORT REVIEWS

N. KAZANTZAKIS, J. T. KAKRIDIS:  
*Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα. Ἑμμετρὴ Μετάφρασις.*  
 Pp. 401. Athens: privately printed,  
 1955. Paper.

THIS book is the outcome of a combined effort over fourteen years of a distinguished novelist and poet, Nikos Kazantzakis, and a distinguished Homeric scholar, Professor J. T. Kakridis. As was to be expected, they have achieved a vigorous and accurate verse translation of the *Iliad* into modern Greek, which by far surpasses all previous efforts in the same field. As the authors themselves admit in their preface 'every translation is a compromise', and this one is no exception. It is indeed impossible to recapture the dignity and the splendour of the Homeric verse in any modern translation, and modern Greek 'demotic' with its medieval, its folk-song, and its everyday associations is a most difficult medium to use for that purpose. How are we, for example, to avoid such associations, when we translate xvi. 698 *ἄφιπλος Τροίην* as *ἀφελόπορτο κάστρο τῆς Τροίας*, or use words like xiv. 34 *φονάστρα* for *λαοί*, xii. 52 *χαυνάκι* for *τέφρος*, or i. 368 *τὰ κοῦρα*? And yet undoubtedly the use of that diction adds power and warmth to the verse. At the same time a great number of Homeric formulae and adjectives have been admirably turned into modern Greek: (e.g. xviii. 399 *ἀφορρόν Ὀκεανοῖο* ~ *Ὀκεῖνός ὁ κυκλορέματος*, xxiii. 27 *ἠφελῆας ἱπποῦς* ~ *τ' ἄλογα τὰ φιλοχλωμιντράτα*, vi. 442 *Τρωάδας Ὀκεοπέπλους* ~ *μακρομαντοῦσες Τρωαδίτισσες*, xxiii. 30 *ἀργοὶ* ~ *στραταλιστά*, etc.), and this is no mean achievement.

But even if the dignity and the splendour of the original is not fully rendered, the outcome of this translation is a 'living' poetry, through which the modern Greeks will be able to grasp much of the vigour, the passion, and the values of the heroic world of the *Iliad*. Until this translation had appeared, those Greeks who could not read the original had known the *Iliad* from the remarkable demotic translation of Alexander Pallis, printed in 1904. In the course of the fifty years which separate that translation from the present one, we not only know much more about Homeric poetry, but we also have at our disposal a much subtler and richer demotic Greek language, as shaped in the hands of the great Greek poets of the

twentieth century, men like Palamas, Sikelianos, or even Kazantzakis himself, who in his own long epic, *The Odyssey*, a work of 33,333 lines, displays a wealth of linguistic material that is truly astounding. Much of this has been used, and often very successfully, by the two translators under review. The one point perhaps which strikes the present reviewer as weak is the choice of metre. Instead of using the 'Politikos Stichos', the 15-syllable verse, the traditional metre of the heroic folk-songs, and one shown to be most suitable for an epic by Palamas' 'Flogera tou Basilia', they employ a 17-syllable line. This too often gives the impression of excessive length, and so detracts from the force of the diction, and the power of the scenes described.

C. A. TRYPANIS

*Exeter College, Oxford*

K. I. KALLIPHATIDES: *Ἑρμηνευτικὴς Παρατηρήσεις στὸν Διάλογο τῶν Μηλίων*, vii. Pp. 27. Thessalonica, 1957. Paper.

I FEAR that Mr. Kalliphatides will not enhance his reputation for judgement or understanding of Thucydides by this new fascicle of his *Observations on the Melian Dialogue* (cf. C.R. N.S. viii. 184). It deals with c. 90 of Book v, and begins with the plausible suggestion that we should read *καὶ μὲν δὴ νομίζομεν γε χρήσιμος*—though he mis-translates *καὶ μὲν δὴ* by *μολαταῦτα* (see iii. 113. 4); but he then says that *παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον τὸ ἐμφέρον* must be a marginal note giving a wrong explanation of *οὕτω*, because *οὕτω λέγειν ὑπέθεσε* refers back to c. 85, *καθ' ἑκαστον . . . κρίνετε*. Not content with this he would bracket *καὶ δίκαια* (in this, following Stahl), *πείσαντέ τινα*, and *ἐπὶ μεγίστῃ τιμωρίᾳ*—all in order that he may interpret *τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθόν* and *τὰ εἰκότα* as the right which all accused persons have to use every possible argument in self-defence, a right which the Athenians may one day need for themselves, when they are accused by others. This, and other suggestions, as that *τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθόν* is here a euphemism for *τὸ ἴδιόν* &c. and that *οὐκ ἀλλότῃ τοῖς ἄλλοις* are to be taken together, are not likely to convince anyone that the difficulties of this chapter have been overcome.

A. W. GOMME

GUNNAR RUDBERG: *Platonica Selecta*. Pp. 141. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1956. Paper, Kr. 9.75.

BEFORE his death in 1954 Professor Rudberg had selected the contents of this book from among various publications of his which had appeared in out-of-the-way places. The English translations, done by various hands, will sometimes baffle the reader by obscurities and misprints. Rudberg was an industrious student of Plato, but, as these essays illustrate, he was less inclined to discuss essential questions of historical and philosophical importance—for which he refers the reader to 'the handbooks'—than to draw rather doubtful deductions from the treatment of such questions by earlier scholars, notably Wilamowitz, and to apply their methods, both good and bad. For example, accepting the view of Wilamowitz and others that Plato's *Symposium* antedates that of Xenophon, he seeks to support it by showing that Xenophon made general use of Plato's 'earlier' dialogues, which here appear, inconsistently with another of the studies in this book, to include *Phaedrus*. The 'evidence' consists of alleged verbal borrowings, demonstrated to be such by their incongruity with the context in Xenophon. Here is a fair sample: in *Phaedo* 117 c Phaedo covered his face and wept, and in Xenophon, *Symp.* i. 14. 15 Philippos covered his face and pretended to weep because of the failure of his jests. Even if the latter incident were not (as it is) perfectly appropriate in its context, such a purely verbal parallel would be of no significance. Similarly the fact that Plato uses *κέρπος* three times in *Phaedrus* 251-4 has no relevance to Xenophon's use of the unplatonic verb *κερπίλλω* in *Symp.* viii. 24.

Some of these essays are linked together by Rudberg's interest in the seventh and eighth *Letters*. One of these is a revision and summary of a book on the date of the *Phaedrus*, published in Swedish in 1924. Because of a certain community of themes, such as the disadvantages of the written word, he thinks that the *Phaedrus* belongs to the same 'period' as the seventh *Letter*, the affinities of the letter with other dialogues being ignored. A good deal is made of the possible reference to Dion at *Phaedr.* 252 e; and so, putting this dialogue between *Theaet.* and *Parm.* for reasons which resemble what Shorey called with some justice the 'historical novel' methods of Wilamowitz, Rudberg concludes rather vaguely that the *Phaedrus* 'must have taken final shape in connection with (Plato's) first (he means

second) sojourn in Syracuse 366-365'. Another Sicilian study suggests that, while Atlantis is a fiction invented 'in large part if not completely' by Plato, Syracuse may have provided him with some material for his picture. Atlantis had quarries, for example; but admittedly it had many other features which were quite different from anything to be found at Syracuse. The Syracusan experiences are the theme of an essay on 'Plato in the First Person', which makes use of the letters to show that a fanciful contrast drawn between Plato and Socrates by N. Söderblom some fifty years ago was much exaggerated. As educators, Plato and Socrates, it is held, were not unlike each other: Plato was to Socrates as Dion was to Plato. Speculating elsewhere on the influence of Socrates on Plato Rudberg concludes that Socrates helped him to 'organize' his intellectual activities, and in particular to subordinate his interest in the cosmos to the ('convictory') interest in humanity.

The essays read like collections of notes, abrupt and unsystematic. Their content is slight, and in my view scarcely justifies the decision to publish them in this form.

J. TATE

FRANCIS HOWARD FOBES: *Averrois commentarium medium in Aristotelis de generatione et corruptione libros*. (Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem, Versionum Latinarum Vol. iv. 1.) Pp. xlv+216. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1956. Cloth.

THIS edition belongs to the same series as those of Averroes' 'Compendium' of the *Parva Naturalia* and 'Commentarium Magnum' on the *De Anima*, which have already been noticed in C.R. (lxv (N.S. i), pp. 237-38; lxix (N.S. v), pp. 68-69).

The editor has performed his task with exemplary care; he has collated thirty-six manuscripts in whole or in part, and has done his best to produce a satisfactory account of their interrelations, though this has been rendered difficult in the extreme by the degree of *contaminatio* in the tradition. Averroes completed his commentary in 1172; it was translated into Latin in the first half of the thirteenth century (very possibly by Michael Scot), and the earliest Latin manuscript dates from 1243. In addition, it was translated into Hebrew by Kalonymus

## SHORT REVIEWS

N. KAZANTZAKIS, J. T. KAKRIDIS: *Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα. Ἑμμετρῇ Μετάφραση*. Pp. 401. Athens: privately printed, 1955. Paper.

THIS book is the outcome of a combined effort over fourteen years of a distinguished novelist and poet, Nikos Kazantzakis, and a distinguished Homeric scholar, Professor J. T. Kakridis. As was to be expected, they have achieved a vigorous and accurate verse translation of the *Iliad* into modern Greek, which by far surpasses all previous efforts in the same field. As the authors themselves admit in their preface 'every translation is a compromise', and this one is no exception. It is indeed impossible to recapture the dignity and the splendour of the Homeric verse in any modern translation, and modern Greek 'demotic' with its medieval, its folk-song, and its everyday associations is a most difficult medium to use for that purpose. How are we, for example, to avoid such associations, when we translate xvi. 698 ὀφίπυλον Τροίην as ἀφελόπορτο κάστρο τῆς Τροίας, or use words like xiv. 34 φουδάτα for λαοί, xii. 52 χαντάκι for τάφος, or i. 368 τὰ κούρσα? And yet undoubtedly the use of that diction adds power and warmth to the verse. At the same time a great number of Homeric formulae and adjectives have been admirably turned into modern Greek: (e.g. xviii. 399 ἀφορρόν Ὀδυσσεύς ~ Ὀδυσσεύς ὁ κυκλορέματος, xxiii. 27 ὕψηλός ἵππους ~ τ' ἄλογα τὰ φιλοχλυμντράτα, vi. 442 Τρωάδας Ὀδυσσεύς ~ μακρομαντοῦσες Τρωαδίτισσες, xxiii. 30 ἄργοι ~ στρανταλιστά, etc.), and this is no mean achievement.

But even if the dignity and the splendour of the original is not fully rendered, the outcome of this translation is a 'living' poetry, through which the modern Greeks will be able to grasp much of the vigour, the passion, and the values of the heroic world of the *Iliad*. Until this translation had appeared, those Greeks who could not read the original had known the *Iliad* from the remarkable demotic translation of Alexander Pallis, printed in 1904. In the course of the fifty years which separate that translation from the present one, we not only know much more about Homeric poetry, but we also have at our disposal a much subtler and richer demotic Greek language, as shaped in the hands of the great Greek poets of the

twentieth century, men like Palamas, Sikelianos, or even Kazantzakis himself, who in his own long epic, *The Odyssey*, a work of 33,333 lines, displays a wealth of linguistic material that is truly astounding. Much of this has been used, and often very successfully, by the two translators under review. The one point perhaps which strikes the present reviewer as weak is the choice of metre. Instead of using the 'Politikos Stichos', the 15-syllable verse, the traditional metre of the heroic folk-songs, and one shown to be most suitable for an epic by Palamas' 'Flogera tou Basilia', they employ a 17-syllable line. This too often gives the impression of excessive length, and so detracts from the force of the diction, and the power of the scenes described.

C. A. TRYFANIS

Exeter College, Oxford

K. I. KALLIPHATIDES: *Ἑρμηνευτικὲς Παρατηρήσεις στὸν Διάλογο τῶν Μηλίων*, vii. Pp. 27. Thessalonica, 1957. Paper.

I FEAR that Mr. Kalliphatides will not enhance his reputation for judgement or understanding of Thucydides by this new fascicle of his *Observations on the Melian Dialogue* (cf. C.R. N.S. viii. 184). It deals with c. 90 of Book v, and begins with the plausible suggestion that we should read *καὶ μὲν δὴ νομιζόμενα γε χρήσιμα*—though he mis-translates *καὶ μὲν δὴ* by *μολαστὰ* (see iii. 113. 4); but he then says that *παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον τὸ συμφέρον* must be a marginal note giving a wrong explanation of *οὕτω*, because *οὕτω λέγειν ὑπέθεσε* refers back to c. 85, *καθ' ἕκαστον . . . κρίνεται*. Not content with this he would bracket *καὶ δίκαια* (in this, following Stahl), *πείσαντά τινα*, and *ἐπὶ μεγίστῃ τιμωρίᾳ*—all in order that he may interpret *τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθόν* and *τὰ εἰκότα* as the right which all accused persons have to use every possible argument in self-defence, a right which the Athenians may one day need for themselves, when they are accused by others. This, and other suggestions, as that *τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθόν* is here a euphemism for *τὸ ἴδιόν* and that *σφαλάντες τοῖς ἄλλοις* are to be taken together, are not likely to convince anyone that the difficulties of this chapter have been overcome.

A. W. GOMME



GUNNAR RUDBERG: *Platonica Selecta*. Pp. 141. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1956. Paper, Kr. 9.75.

BEFORE his death in 1954 Professor Rudberg had selected the contents of this book from among various publications of his which had appeared in out-of-the-way places. The English translations, done by various hands, will sometimes baffle the reader by obscurities and misprints. Rudberg was an industrious student of Plato, but, as these essays illustrate, he was less inclined to discuss essential questions of historical and philosophical importance—for which he refers the reader to 'the handbooks'—than to draw rather doubtful deductions from the treatment of such questions by earlier scholars, notably Wilamowitz, and to apply their methods, both good and bad. For example, accepting the view of Wilamowitz and others that Plato's *Symposium* antedates that of Xenophon, he seeks to support it by showing that Xenophon made general use of Plato's 'earlier' dialogues, which here appear, inconsistently with another of the studies in this book, to include *Phaedrus*. The 'evidence' consists of alleged verbal borrowings, demonstrated to be such by their incongruity with the context in Xenophon. Here is a fair sample: in *Phaedo* 117c *Phaedo* covered his face and wept, and in *Xenophon, Symp.* i. 14. 15 *Philippus* covered his face and pretended to weep because of the failure of his jests. Even if the latter incident were not (as it is) perfectly appropriate in its context, such a purely verbal parallel would be of no significance. Similarly the fact that Plato uses *κέρπος* three times in *Phaedrus* 251-4 has no relevance to Xenophon's use of the unplatonic verb *κερπίλλω* in *Symp.* viii. 24.

Some of these essays are linked together by Rudberg's interest in the seventh and eighth *Letters*. One of these is a revision and summary of a book on the date of the *Phaedrus*, published in Swedish in 1924. Because of a certain community of themes, such as the disadvantages of the written word, he thinks that the *Phaedrus* belongs to the same 'period' as the seventh *Letter*, the affinities of the letter with other dialogues being ignored. A good deal is made of the possible reference to Dion at *Phaedr.* 252c; and so, putting this dialogue between *Theaet.* and *Parm.* for reasons which resemble what Shorey called with some justice the 'historical novel' methods of Wilamowitz, Rudberg concludes rather vaguely that the *Phaedrus* 'must have taken final shape in connection with (Plato's) first (he means

second) sojourn in Syracuse 366-365'. Another Sicilian study suggests that, while Atlantis is a fiction invented 'in large part if not completely' by Plato, Syracuse may have provided him with some material for his picture. Atlantis had quarries, for example; but admittedly it had many other features which were quite different from anything to be found at Syracuse. The Syracusan experiences are the theme of an essay on 'Plato in the First Person', which makes use of the letters to show that a fanciful contrast drawn between Plato and Socrates by N. Söderblom some fifty years ago was much exaggerated. As educators, Plato and Socrates, it is held, were not unlike each other: Plato was to Socrates as Dion was to Plato. Speculating elsewhere on the influence of Socrates on Plato Rudberg concludes that Socrates helped him to 'organize' his intellectual activities, and in particular to subordinate his interest in the cosmos to the ('contradictory') interest in humanity.

The essays read like collections of notes, abrupt and unsystematic. Their content is slight, and in my view scarcely justifies the decision to publish them in this form.

J. TATE

FRANCIS HOWARD FOBES: *Averrois commentarium medium in Aristotelis de generatione et corruptione libros*. (*Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem, Versionum Latinarum Vol. iv. 1.*) Pp. xlv+216. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1956. Cloth.

THIS edition belongs to the same series as those of Averroes' 'Compendium' of the *Parva Naturalia* and 'Commentarium Magnum' on the *De Anima*, which have already been noticed in *C.R.* (lxv (n.s. i), pp. 237-38; lxix (n.s. v), pp. 68-69).

The editor has performed his task with exemplary care; he has collated thirty-six manuscripts in whole or in part, and has done his best to produce a satisfactory account of their interrelations, though this has been rendered difficult in the extreme by the degree of *contaminatio* in the tradition. Averroes completed his commentary in 1172; it was translated into Latin in the first half of the thirteenth century (very possibly by Michael Scot), and the earliest Latin manuscript dates from 1243. In addition, it was translated into Hebrew by Kalonymus

ben Kalonymus in 1316, and Professor Fobes, aided by Mr. S. Kurland, has made use both of the Arabic original and of the Hebrew version in the construction of his text. In addition to text and textual prolegomena, he has printed a full apparatus criticus and a large 'Glossarium Latino-Arabico-Hebraico-Graecum'.

Of Averroes's cross-references to other works of Aristotle, not all are found in the text of G.C. itself; those added by Averroes are to *Ph.* vi, *Cael.* i, iii, and iv, and *Mete.* iv. In addition, he refers apparently, in a digression (pp. 48-55), to Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione* 235. 34-237. 25 (towards the end of that work); and also at two points (on 324<sup>a</sup>1 and 330<sup>a</sup>25) to Alexander's now lost commentary on G.C., whose contents can in general be inferred only from that of Philoponus, who used it copiously. Averroes seems to have had direct access to Alexander's commentary; he refers to Alexander by name at one point (324<sup>a</sup>1 ff.) where Philoponus does not mention him. Avicenna 'in sermone suo super capitulum Aristotelis' is referred to at the end of Book i; p. 151 has a reference to Mahomet.

The commentary has been published twice previously, at Padua in 1474 and by the Juntine Press at Venice in 1550; page and line references to the Juntine edition are given here.

The editor and his assistant are to be congratulated on their work.

D. A. REES

Jesus College, Oxford

JAN LUKASIEWICZ: *Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic*. Second edition enlarged. Pp. xvi+222. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 30s. net.

THE second edition of this book consists of 'lithographs' of the 132 pages of the first edition of 1951 (reviewed in *C.R.* lxxvii. 118), followed by 76 pages of new matter and a correspondingly enlarged index. The juxtaposition of 'lithograph' and new printing sadly illustrates the inferiority of the former. The few errors that have been discovered in the first edition are not corrected in the 'lithograph', but merely listed inconspicuously at the end of the enlarged table of contents.

The new matter is a discussion of Aristotle's modal logic, that is, of *De Interpretatione* 9 and 13, and *Prior Analytics* i. 3 and

8-22. Like the old matter, it is very penetrating and interesting and trenchant and novel; but it is much less convincing. Lukasiewicz here replaces his 1920 system of modal logic with a new one, against which, he thinks, 'no serious objection can be maintained'. There is, however, a very serious objection to it, namely that it leads to the consequence that 'no apodeictic proposition is true', apodeictic propositions being those beginning with 'it is necessary that' and their equivalents. Lukasiewicz declares five times that 'no apodeictic proposition is true', and calls this an 'important discovery'. But in fact it is either a disproof of his system by reduction to absurdity, or a proof that his system has nothing to do with the ordinary meanings of the words 'possibility' and 'necessity'. A better account of the logic of necessity and possibility than either Aristotle's or Lukasiewicz's was given by Lewis and Langford in their *Symbolic Logic*.

On pp. 151-4 there seem to be misinterpretations of Aristotle 19<sup>a</sup>23 and 18<sup>a</sup>39.

Readers will find it useful to enter the following additions to the index: α is defined on p. 170, δ on p. 139, ε and ζ on p. 167, F on p. 163, II on p. 86, S on p. 163, and V on p. 163. Very important pages for the notion of rejection are 94-98, 103-4, 115, 136, and 170.

RICHARD ROBINSON

Oriel College, Oxford

MATTHIAS GELZER: *Über die Arbeitsweise des Polybios*. (Sitz. der Heidelberger Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1956, 3.) Pp. 36. Heidelberg: Winter, 1956. Paper.

IN this paper Professor Gelzer examines Polybius' methods of composition, more particularly in relation to his personal contacts during his residence in Italy. Much of Polybius' material was gained by personal inquiry, and his advantageous friendship with the young Scipio Aemilianus is generally supposed to have opened up valuable sources of information to him. Gelzer, however, would distinguish between the later period after Scipio had become a senator and a man of importance, who would have direct knowledge of senatorial debates and policy, and an earlier period (before c. 153) when Scipio will have been less useful to Polybius and when most senators would regard Polybius merely as an internecine. At this time Polybius' main source of information will

have been the numerous Greek envoys that visited Rome, and Greek circles in Rome in general. Gelzer traces the use that Polybius could have made of men like Menyllus, the ambassador of Ptolemy Philometor, for knowledge of senatorial policy towards the younger Ptolemy (163/162) or towards the escape of Demetrius; and Menochares, ambassador of Demetrius Soter in 159. Further, it is generally believed that Polybius wrote an account of the escape of Demetrius from Italy soon after the event, and later (though before 146) incorporated this into his *History* (xxxi. 11-15) when a disclosure of Polybius' own part in the incident would no longer be dangerous to him; Gelzer suggests that Polybius probably compiled other such *ὑπομνήματα*. Gelzer also develops his earlier view (Abh. Akad. Berlin, 1940, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 2) that Polybius, before he came to Rome, had drafted an 'Achaica' (thus continuing the work of his fellow Achaean Aratus whose *Memoirs* ended at 220 B.C.); this he later adapted to his *Universal History*, and Gelzer shows how Polybius could draw some of the extra material from Rhodian historians, as Zenon; in this task of shaping his literary sources Polybius will have followed a method approved by Hellenistic historiography. Whatever may be thought of Gelzer's theory of an 'Achaica' (it has been accepted by K. Ziegler in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Polybius, col. 1476, but doubted by H. Bengtson, *Griech. Gesch.* 343), his emphasis on Polybius' Greek sources and Greek contacts while he was in Rome is a valuable corrective to the too facile belief in mainly Roman sources of information. It is clearly impossible to guess how much knowledge of public affairs would be available to a man like Aemilianus when young or how much he would pass on to his friend Polybius. Gelzer does mention a possible contact with a more senior statesman, the elder Gracchus, whose marriage with Cornelia he places in 164; but 165/164 is merely the *terminus ante quem*, and the marriage may have been c. 170 (P. Fraccaro, *Athenaeum*, 1931, p. 310) even if not as early as 175 (J. Carcopino, *Autour des Gracques*, ch. 2; Gelzer notes neither of these suggestions). Thus Gracchus may have had an earlier contact with the Scipionic group, and Polybius may have known Gracchus earlier. But such speculation is not very fruitful: what Gelzer has made clear is that while in Rome Polybius moved in both Greek and Roman circles and only gradually did the latter predominate.

H. H. SCULLARD

King's College, London

Diodorus Siculus. With an English translation by F. R. WALTON. Vol. xi (Books xxi-xxxii). (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxv+464; map. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.

PROFESSOR WALTON is to be congratulated on this excellent volume. The task of editing the fragments is more difficult than that of translating the continuous books, and in this volume much original work has been done in arranging and commenting on the fragments. The introduction reminds us that the worth of Diodorus' history cannot be measured by his ineptitudes alone. Our knowledge of the period 301-60 B.C. would be immensely greater if the last twenty books had survived intact. Even as it is, the wreckage is full of interest to the historian. The fragments we possess were transmitted mainly by Byzantine excerptors, who used their own diction on many occasions and introduced their own errors of fact, and the text is difficult to establish as it often rests on a single manuscript. The last critical edition, by Ludwig Dindorf, was published in 1828-31, and Walton has rendered valuable service by editing a new text with a fairly full critical apparatus and with a conservative approach to the earlier tradition.

The historical notes are short and apposite. There are many references to passages in other historians who deal with the same events, and interesting notes are given on comparisons between Diodorus and Polybius. The chronology is carefully done. Dates are entered in the margin, and notes are given when the chronology is disputed, with special reference to Niese and Broughton. There are three indexes, and also a good map of Sicily. It is thus a handy edition for the historian to consult.

The content of Books xxi-xxxii is an extraordinary hotch-potch of events and styles. Military affairs in Sicily predominate, but one ranges from the inventions of Archimedes to the changes of sex which were regarded by some as portents. This variety imposes a heavy demand on the translator, and he has carried out the task very well on the whole. There is a pleasant freshness in many phrases such as 'deceiving the deceiver on his own ground' and 'many are the futilities of warfare', and the rather florid style of Diodorus is reproduced with distinction in many passages. Some sentences struck me as odd, even beyond the oddness of their original: 'Attalus made short work of wooing the queen', 'one of the bodyguards,

bursting into the bath, announced that the enemy were upon them' and 'shot them down one and all with darts'. 'Sexreme' and 'niner' are awkward terms to use of naval vessels, and 'mongrel Greek slaves' is somewhat ambiguous. But these are small points of criticism (I may add the spelling of a few names—Loitanus, Kaeso, and Nectum, which are not consistent with the author's usual and admirable practice—the use of Bisaltica for Bisaltia on p. 329, Galus for Gallus on p. 359 note 1, and 'on' for 'in' on p. 277). It is, in short, a really important addition to the Loeb series and praiseworthy in all respects.

N. G. L. HAMMOND

Clifton College, Bristol

MARTIN SICHERL: *Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen von Iamblichos De Mysteriis*. (Texte und Untersuchungen, v Reihe, Band 7.) Pp. xvi+226; 16 plates. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957. Paper, DM. 33.50.

THIS sixty-second volume of *Texte und Untersuchungen* is an impressive forerunner of the critical edition of the *De Mysteriis* on which Dr. Sicherl announces that he is engaged (pp. 200-1). It both makes abundantly clear the need for such an edition and shows that Sicherl's text will be established on extremely solid foundations. After an interesting introduction on the methods to be employed in the classification and description of manuscripts, the author proceeds to a precise and detailed description of all manuscripts of the *De Mysteriis* (including excerpts and fragments) which are known to him—and it seems extremely unlikely that there is any important evidence for the text which he has overlooked. Then follows a chapter on the archetype, of which Sicherl regards the principal manuscripts M and V as direct copies, and which he consequently dates shortly before the middle of the fifteenth century. The book ends with a chapter of considerable historical interest on the editions and translations; it is noteworthy that the Latin translation, or rather paraphrase, of Marsilius Ficinus, first printed in 1497 (followed by the full translation of Scutellius printed in 1556), preceded by so long an interval the *editio princeps* of the complete Greek text produced by Thomas Gale (Oxford, 1678). Another interesting, and somewhat disconcerting,

feature of the history of the *De Mysteriis* in the Renaissance and post-Renaissance world is the unbounded enthusiasm shown by Ficinus and his circle (as later by Thomas Taylor, whose translation Sicherl praises) for this foundation-treatise of theurgic Neoplatonism. For the Platonists of the Renaissance, it appears, as for the later Neoplatonists of the fifth and sixth centuries, Iamblichus was at least on a level with Plotinus. It seems to be only in comparatively modern times that the distance which separates Plotinus from these later Neoplatonists has been clearly enough perceived—indeed it is perhaps not always sufficiently observed today by those who have no close acquaintance with Plotinus.

The general principles upon which Sicherl has worked, and the care, patience, and enthusiasm with which he has carried out his task, are certainly beyond criticism. And any worthwhile criticism of details would be not only impertinent but impossible for anyone who has not gone over the same ground with equal thoroughness. It seems likely that Sicherl's edition, which it is to be hoped will not be too long delayed, will do as much for the text of the *De Mysteriis* as the Henry-Schwyzer edition for that of Plotinus.

The book is provided with the necessary *Stemma Codicum* and sixteen tolerable plates of Greek manuscripts and those of the translations of Ficinus, Scutellius, and Holstenius. The indexes are full and from a random sampling appear to be accurate.

A. H. ARMSTRONG

University of Liverpool

LOUIS COHN-HAFT: *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece*. (Smith College Studies in History, vol. xlii.) Pp. x+91. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College (Department of History), 1956. Paper, \$1.50.

THE essence of this short monograph may be briefly stated. The title 'public physician' in Ancient Greece connoted no more than a doctor whose fixed residence in a given city was guaranteed for a particular period; it did not amount to an articulated system of public medical service, as others have supposed, but was a familiar expedient, at an epoch when doctors were not easily to be come by, to persuade a doctor to stay in a locality which needed him. Such a conclusion, based on a careful survey of the evidence, tempers the enthusiasm of those who might exaggerate resemblances of practice



between the ancient and modern welfare states. It does not invalidate the chief thesis of other recent discussions of the institution, that the attitudes of ancient and modern governments towards their duty to the citizen body have much in common, especially as regards the duty to ensure that medical service is readily at hand: but that we should be chary of saying much more than that, Cohn-Haft gives a justifiable warning. Even if the points he raises are neither as novel nor as convincing as he appears to think, the author has produced a valuable survey which subsequent discussions must take carefully into account; especially useful is the attempt, not otherwise made in recent times, to compile a full list of epigraphic *testimonia*. There is, however, difficulty in drawing the line between material concerning doctors in general and that concerning public doctors in particular; Cohn-Haft's list might from one point of view be abbreviated and from another be considerably expanded, but even as it stands it is welcome.

It is a pity that Cohn-Haft felt the best recommendation of his own work to consist in the denigration of that of others, for it could have stood comfortably on its own merits. The chief folly of his predecessors seems to be that they did not think of writing his thesis before he did, and he has not troubled to observe that there are differences between the scope and character of their contributions and of his. This treatment in the end produces the opposite effect from that intended, for the reader, wearied of the intemperance of the author's approach, becomes less receptive to the argument and receives an unfavourable impression of the author's personality. One is reminded of Sir Neville Henderson's criticism of Ribbentrop, that he 'mistook rudeness for strength'. With greater maturity Cohn-Haft will perhaps surmount the error, into which so many have fallen, of valuing the brittle cleverness of the *ἀνάρμοστα ἐς τὸ παραρηχθῆναι* and neglecting the greatest of scholarly virtues, that of humility. When he has done so we may, to judge from this essay, expect some acute and notable contributions from his pen.

A. G. WOODHEAD

Corpus Christi College,  
Cambridge

AURELIO R. BUJALDON: *Cicerón, Segunda Acción contra Verres: Libro quinto, Los Suplicios*. Pp. xvi+107 (mostly double). Mendoza, Argen-

tina: Universidad de Cuyo, Instituto de Lenguas Clásicas, 1957. Paper.

THIS edition contains a reprint of Bornecque's Budé text (without the apparatus criticus), a Spanish translation, a short introduction, and notes. It will provide a welcome stimulus to Ciceronian studies in South American schools and universities; but, as the commentary is brief, and seems to contain nothing new, it will attract less attention in this country.

R. G. M. NISBET

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

MANUEL MARÍN PEÑA: *Cicerón, Discursos*, vol. x: *Defensa de L. Murena, Defensa de P. Sila*. Texto revisado y traducido. (Colección Hispánica.) Pp. 166 (some double). Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1956 (1957). Cloth.

PROFESSOR PEÑA's text is basically an apograph of Kasten's, as he himself acknowledges. The chief novelty lies in the omissions and misprints, which are not always easy to emend: see *Mur.* 2, 11, 14, 16, 41, 45, 48, 61, 73, *Sull.* 62. Sentences are wrongly divided at *Mur.* 26, 45, 50, 53. Some readings adopted from Kasten disrupt clausulae: see *Mur.* 51 *partim quia timebant* (<nimium>), 66 *quis vero C. Laelio comior* (<fuit>), 71 *ipsorum suffragium tenuis*, *Sull.* 17 *signa* (<ad>) *legiones*, 71 *spoliare fana sociorum* (<vidimus>). At *Mur.* 3 the manuscripts in general read *is cui res publica a me una traditur sustinenda magnis meis laboribus et periculis sustentata*. For *una* Peña reads *universa*, following a suggestion of Clark's; R. Klotz proposed *iam*; possibly *nunc* might be worth considering.

The apparatus also reproduces Kasten, though a few crumbs are derived from Clark or Boulanger. Peña often shows his originality by finding a different form of words from Kasten's, but it is dangerous to tamper with somebody else's apparatus in this way. In the list of sigla to the *pro Murena* Peña, unlike Kasten, cites S and W, though in fact he hardly ever quotes them; as a result, when he refers to *codd.* or *cett.* in his apparatus, he is making statements about S and W for which he has no authority. At *Mur.* 15 W is a corruption of *u*, which means something else in Kasten. At *Mur.* 20 *huic laudis* appears in the text, and at *Mur.* 61 *huius modi*; it is not recorded in the apparatus that the former is an emendation and the latter has

negligible authority. There are other slips in the apparatus at *Mur.* 4, 8, 15, 17, 26, 71, 73, 77, 79, *Sull.* 82.

Peña has supplied short historical introductions to the two speeches. He should have been more sceptical about the so-called First Catilinarian Conspiracy. There are a few notes and an *index nominum*, meagre but not impeccable. The present reviewer is unable to discuss the Spanish translation. The book is lavishly produced.

This edition may be disregarded outside Spain and Latin America. It may, however, be of some use to those Spanish-speaking students who cannot understand Boulanger's French.

R. G. M. NISBET

Corpus Christi College,  
Oxford

FELICITÀ PORTALUPI: *Sulla Corrente Rodiese*. Pp. 32. Turin: Giappichelli, 1957. Paper, L. 400.

IN this brief monograph Portalupi examines the statement, still recurrent in general histories of Roman Literature, that Cicero was an orator of the 'Rhodian' school. She asks the two pertinent questions: (i) What were the characteristics of 'Rhodianism'?, (ii) Had Cicero those characteristics? Analysing the limited evidence, she argues that Rhodian doctrine was entirely practical, designed to produce orators, not merely clever declaimers, but rejecting philosophy and general culture. Cicero, she concludes, owed much to Rhodian teaching, as he declares (*Brut.* 316), but far transcended its limitations. In particular, he attached the highest importance to philosophy and general culture in the training of an orator. The attempt to connect Cicero with Rhodianism because he advocated the use of all three oratorical Styles (Grand, Middle, Plain) Portalupi justly rejects, though she is scarcely more plausible than her opponents in connecting 'Asianism' with the Middle Style and in arguing that Cicero himself introduced the idea of imitating Demosthenes and the Grand Style. In exposing the muddle-headed vagueness of his Atticist critics, Cicero suggests that they would claim to imitate any Attic orator including Demosthenes (*Brut.* 288).

Such weakness as there is in Portalupi's work lies in her acceptance of 'Atticism' and 'Asianism' as 'given' starting-points for the investigation of 'Rhodianism'. I have elsewhere supported the view that 'Atticism' and 'Asianism' were not movements with

a history but catchwords of literary controversy incapable of exact definition. I do not retract this. But I also accepted that Cicero's description of Rhodianism was little more than a compliment to his teachers. Portalupi has, however, shown that there was substance in Cicero's suggestion that Rhodian oratory represented a distinct school. The conclusion to be drawn, though perhaps novel, is not really surprising: 'Atticism' and 'Asianism' were vague polemical terms, only in appearance historical or geographical, but the oratory taught in the second and first centuries in the island of Rhodes can be more precisely described. In so describing it and Cicero's relation to it as to show that genius is not readily to be classified or reduced to indebtedness to shadowy predecessors, Portalupi has performed a useful service.

A. E. DOUGLAS

University of Southampton

SUETONIUS: *The Twelve Caesars*. A new translation by ROBERT GRAVES. Pp. 315; 12 coin-portraits. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1957. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

SUETONIUS is unkind to the conscientious translator: his style contrives to be non-descript, but not uniformly so, and he is full of remarks which require expansion and exegesis even for the reader who is familiar with the period. Graves has attempted to transform the *Lives* into something like his usual racy language, and for the most part succeeds, but at a certain cost. In particular, current phrases are forced in regardless of context, as the 'intellectuals' on p. 99, 'residential centre of Capri' (for *vicinam Capreis insulam*) on p. 105, 'waitresses' on p. 130, 'coming-of-age parties' (*iuvencalia*) and 'food-parcels' on p. 214; while 'the working-class' on p. 283 misses the point of Vespasian's *plebicula*. Oddly enough his renderings of the famous sayings are very stilted, though free, especially the epigram on Caesar and Bibulus (p. 17) and Augustus' remarks about Ajax and asparagus (p. 97). His version of *qualis artifex pereo* (p. 238) does not merit a place in Henderson's collection. Again, the need for explanation leads to some strange glosses among many sensible ones: on p. 27 Caesar's crowds appear without warrant from the text 'on roof-tops'; a highly questionable interpretation of *hypocrita* (p. 221), an impossibly elaborate one of *Salvito* (p. 36), and an anachronistic one of

*tribuni aerarii* (p. 27) are inserted without a blush into the narrative; on p. 16 the bare *pacata provincia* is enriched with most of what Plutarch and Dio together tell us of Caesar's Spanish campaign; and on p. 213 one of the charges reported by Tacitus as brought against Domitia Lepida is tacked on, in inaccurate language, to Suetonius' account. The prize under this head must go to p. 137, where Cinaria is first glossed, relevantly enough, as 'the Aegean isle', and then as 'the home of the artichoke'. When, on the other hand, Graves decides to employ orthodox footnotes (which he does with proper restraint), his selection is determined unduly by his private quirks and fancies: thus Nonius Asprenas and Benenice are the only individuals to merit prosopographical notes (pp. 82, 290); the mysterious Chrestus on p. 197 is dismissed tersely with 'i.e. Christ'; the Naples earthquake on p. 218 is explained by an unacknowledged quotation from Tacitus' quite inconsistent account; on p. 309 Domitian's raven earns an irrelevant note which appears to refer only to the Middle Ages; on p. 30 *margaritae*, translated in spite of Pliny and Tacitus as 'fresh-water pearls', are accompanied with a merry piece of suburban London lore; and the note on Claudius' poisoning, on p. 207, scores a very high mark for reliance on the historical omniscience of an unusual authority.

Apart from a crop of misspellings towards the end of the book, such as 'Cutian pool' and 'Arrecinius' on pp. 253, 303 (correct on pp. 82, 311), and numerical emendations (?) on pp. 38 and 119, the translator admits some actual mistakes which are sometimes silly, sometimes inexplicable. Thus on p. 54 the name Augustus is derived from 'the phrase *avium gestus gustus-ae*', rather than from one of the alternatives; the account of Titus Tatius on p. 109 is wildly at sea; that of the status of an imperial province on p. 197 is both misleading and horribly worded; Nero's ancestors on p. 210 are gratuitously misnamed; and on p. 260 Suetonius' father becomes 'tribune of the people' (the more noticeably since military tribunes appear, rather unnecessarily, as 'colonels'). In addition, Graves seems to think that the senate was composed entirely of patricians (p. 27); that Ravenna commands the Eastern Mediterranean (p. 79); that there could be two Chief Pontiffs at once (p. 111), and something called 'subsidiary consuls' (p. 142); that a *locusta* is a crab (p. 139). Simple inability to cope with the Latin must be responsible for such assertions as that Suetonius repudiates the

authority of Marathus on Augustus' height (p. 95); that the infant Nero might have been called Claudius, presumably as a praenomen (p. 212); that Nero actually committed incest in the litter (p. 224); and that Antonius Primus personally killed Vitellius (p. 272). I have noted a further score or more of bad mistakes, and a vast number of petty ones. These would not matter so much if one did not expect some readers to use this book to inform themselves both about what Suetonius really says and about life under the early Empire. As it is, for the latter purpose at least, *I, Claudius* is probably a safer authority.

G. B. TOWNEND

University of Liverpool

ALEXANDER GRUZEWSKI: *De xvi Iuvenalis Codicibus qui in Polonia asservantur*. (Auctarium Maeandream, v.) Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1956. Paper, zł. 14.

At Poznań in 1950 a congress of Polish philologists decided to collate all the classical manuscripts in their country, many of which had never been competently scrutinized. Gruzewski here gives a detailed report of the sixteen Juvenal texts, written in a workman-like Latin, with an adequate facsimile of each document.

All prove to be fourteenth-century or later, and none contributes to the solution of any long-standing problem in Juvenal's text, or poses a fresh one. Eleven are stated to be of Italian origin, and one German; the four remaining are claimed (p. 14) as Polish. Gruzewski very properly prefaces his account by a brief statement of Knoche's classification of the Juvenal manuscripts and reproduces his stemmata,<sup>1</sup> to which he faithfully adheres, as indeed must anyone usefully employed on the jungle-growth of *recentiores* of this author. Discounting some admixture, inevitable in such late documents, three of the Polish manuscripts turn out to be specimens of the *S*-class (satires 15 and 16 transposed in all and lines 108 and 109 of satire 11 in two); *S*-features predominate in five others and are apparent in three more. Four of the remainder show

<sup>1</sup> The references to  $\delta$  and  $\beta$  on pp. 10 and 11 have no business there, as these symbols do not appear either in figs. 4 and 6 of this book or in Knoche's diagrams (*Grundlagen*, pp. 374 and 379).

links with the *I*-family (though with *II*-associations) and one (Bibl. Jagellonica 1951) is in some degree representative of the *II*-class, at any rate for its text of satires 6-16.

One suspects that the book was produced under not exactly ideal conditions, but the assigning of the manuscripts to their respective classes appears correct. Nevertheless, when all allowances have been made, the presentation is slipshod and one hopes that future volumes in this series will avoid the pitfalls here enumerated: (1) Presumably Grużewski used Knoche's text of 1949 for basis of collation (this is not explicitly stated); if so, Knoche's readings ought not to appear as the second entries in the reports of variants on, for example, 10. 21, 10. 184, 15. 107 on p. 82, and elsewhere. (2) Some of Grużewski's sigla for his manuscripts overlap with those applied by Knoche to quite different documents. Provided that the comma by which the 'Polish' readings are separated from the others is not dropped in printing (as it is in three successive entries on p. 19, and elsewhere), perhaps no harm is done. (3) There is far too much reporting of orthographical triviality. (4) Detail is set out very uneconomically, with much repetition and inconsistency; it has in fact proved rather beyond the printer's abilities and a plethora of disconcerting misprints survive undetected: p. 17 alone contains 9 false references, a muddle in the entry on 15. 35, and some minor blemishes. Some are easily corrigible by anyone who knows his Juvenal, and it is true that a rather less intensive search did not find any subsequent page to be quite so typographically disastrous. However, frequent mis-statements such as that on p. 54 on 14. 115 are disconcerting, and for a sample of irritating inconsistency of detail compare the entry against 13. 132 on its several reappearances (pp. 16, 19, 22, 34, 42, and 49).

Error would have been saved and clarity gained by a more selective presentation of material, either in terms of collation against a standard text with exclusion of minor variants not essential to the argument, or, given accurate proof-checking, by a multi-column layout, running if necessary across the double page. It was perhaps unfortunate that Juvenal, whose textual history is so exceptionally complex, should have been among the first authors to be treated in this series.

Possibly the most interesting of these sixteen manuscripts has 'very rich' scholia (p. 81), and the facsimiles show annotations in others too; Grużewski makes no report of them. I hope, however, he may be

encouraged to investigate these scholia and, if results justify it, publish them.

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

Jesus College, Oxford

ULRICH KNOCHE: *Die römische Satire*. 2. mit einem Nachtrag versehene Auflage. Pp. 122. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957. Paper, DM. 6.40.

THE second edition of Knoche's useful work reproduces the text of the first edition (1949) unaltered, with a *Nachtrag* of a dozen pages to bring it up to date. Much of this is inevitably little more than a list of books and articles, but it contains some helpful brief criticisms, notably of Puelma's *Lucilius und Kallimachos* ('Das Problem also: Ennius-Lucilius-Phoinix-Kallimachos, ist mit gestellt; gelöst scheint es mir durch Puelma keineswegs'); of Klingner's *Horace* ('tatsächlich die beste kritische Handausgabe des Horaz . . . , die es gibt'); of Bagnani's attribution of the *Apocolyntosis* to Petronius (dismissed); of Marmorale's *La questione Petroniana* ('Das Buch bringt auch dem Bereicherung, der die Ergebnisse ablehnt'); of Clausen's *Persius* (generously praised); of Highet's *Juvenal the Satirist* ('ein nützliches Juvenal-Handbuch, das freilich auch nicht gerade selten den Widerspruch herausfordert, und das in wichtigen Punkten der kritisch geläuterten Ergänzung dringend bedarf'). I have noticed a few mistakes in the citations of books: in particular it ought to be made clear that *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* has ceased publication (p. 111).

It is to be hoped that this series will increase and multiply. There is great need for such handbooks as this, by which, in Knoche's own words, 'vor allem soll der Leser an die wissenschaftlichen Probleme der vielgliedrigen Materie herangeführt werden, damit er, durch die Darstellung ermuntert, sich selbst sein Urteil bilde' (p. 111). Why are they so rare in English? Our scholarship seems to shirk these unspectacular but necessary tasks. In particular the student of classical literature, which attracts so much ill-informed and tendentious exegesis, badly needs objective and sober guidance through the mazes of ancient evidence and modern polemic.

E. J. KENNEY

Peterhouse, Cambridge



MARIE O'REILLY: *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Excidio Urbis Romae Sermo*. A critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary. (Patristic Studies, vol. lxxxix.) Pp. xviii+96. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1955. Paper, \$1.25.

In all printed editions of St. Augustine, the *De Excidio Urbis Romae* is set apart from the *Sermons*, and it has been somewhat neglected. Indeed, though now generally accepted, its authenticity has been questioned, among others by Erasmus. Besides confirming the attribution to Augustine, which she does satisfactorily, Sister O'Reilly's main object is to establish a critical text. She has used twenty manuscripts, eighteen of which fall readily into two groups, *y* (the manuscripts of the Tripartite Collection, Book 1, with two others) and *z* (eleven manuscripts). The two oldest manuscripts, *W*, a Wolfenbüttel manuscript of the ninth century (though Bernard Bischoff puts it later) and *G*, a St. Gall manuscript also of the ninth century, but incomplete, do not fall into either group and differ from each other. There is also the testimony of Florus, himself writing in the ninth century and using a text of the *y* group. Deciding in principle against an eclectic text, Sister O'Reilly bases her edition 'primarily' on *W*, though she shrinks from printing *W* as it stands. Without making a searching analysis of the evidence, she gives good reasons of a general character for her preference; but, having made some concessions to eclecticism, she might have gone farther. Thus at g. 26, *W*'s *filium misit* seems to me a poor gloss, with Florus as well as the other manuscripts all against it, and if *caruerunt casus* (g. 36, *W* only) is accepted, the grammar might have a note.

This sermon, interesting as any observation of Augustine on the fall of Rome must be, requires little commentary. Of real value, however, is the information collected in the Introduction about the manuscript tradition, especially about certain early collections of Augustine's sermons. Sister O'Reilly fully recognizes her debt to Doms Morin, Wilmart, and Lambot, without whom one suspects that she would have been rather lost. Given that dependence, she has produced a convenient and sensible edition.

S. L. GREENSLADE

Selwyn College, Cambridge

ANTONIO QUACQUARELLI: *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Ad Scapulam. Prolegomeni, Testo Critico e Commento*. (Opuscula Patrum, i.) Pp. 131. Paris: Desclée et Cie., 1957. Paper.

THE open letter to Scapula, the shortest of Tertullian's writings, takes up two of the themes already treated at length in the *Apologeticum* and *Ad Nationes*, namely that Christians are not atheists, nor are they disloyal citizens, the writer's object being not to obtain a cessation of persecution (for Christians regard this as to their advantage) but to fulfil his Christian duty of warning the governor of the divine penalties which await persecutors. The letter, in itself of no theological and little historical importance, provides the editor with the opportunity (which he has used to good effect) of treating of various matters connected with the author's works, his style, and his vocabulary. If we say that it will serve as a sound introduction to the study of these aspects of Tertullian's work, this is not to mean that there is here anything elementary: there is a thorough treatment of the matters in hand, such as in an edition of one of the longer or more important works would have to be crowded out by more urgent questions.

The book begins with an imposing *bibliographia citata*, and a later note on early editions of Tertullian shows direct acquaintance with these and quotes extensively from those editors' remarks on their predecessors. The section on the manuscript tradition, no less than the apparatus criticus, takes note of all surviving manuscripts. Particularly useful is a long note on rhetorical forms (*schemi rhetorici*) and on Tertullian's clausulae. The editor argues convincingly that the letter was written in the autumn of 212: to one's surprise it appears that there were six eclipses of the sun visible at Utica between 197 and 212, though other considerations prove that it has to be the last of them to which Tertullian refers.

The text is printed in cola, a device which accentuates the rhythm of the phrases at the expense of the flow of the sentences, and makes for difficult reading. An exhaustive, and exhausting, apparatus criticus follows each of the five chapters. One might question whether some of the manuscript variants, and a few of the conjectures, were worth recording. With the text as established there will be little disagreement: *ante cum animas nostras auctorati* (chapter 1) is not easy to understand, and is not explained in the notes: *quod ipsa Carthago passura est* (chapter

5) is even for Tertullian an unusual form of question (and what can a previous editor have meant by *quid ipse Carthago?*): in chapter 3 *dammasset* is apparently a slip or misprint for *dammasset*.

The notes are beyond praise. In addition to biographical notices of persons they comprise a large number of well-documented expositions of Tertullian's terminology: future editors of Tertullian, and compilers of lexicons, will do well to look at them, having first consulted the excellent index in search of words of immediate interest. One might question (p. 78) whether *cuius reus gaudet* (Apol. 1) is an example of *gaudere* governing the genitive, and even if it were it could hardly be a hellenism, since *χαλπεω* does not do so. On p. 112 the note on *in Iovis nomine* is misconceived, and the quotation from Seneca (interesting as it is in itself) is beside the point: for what Tertullian means, as he says more clearly elsewhere, is that, little as they know it, when the populace refer to one supreme god, *qui solus potens*, they are, in spite of their calling him Jupiter, paying unwitting testimony to the one God. On p. 97 read *Libyam*.

The usefulness of this edition is out of all proportion to its small volume or to the unimportance of Tertullian's letter which lies behind it. The abbreviation 'Q. S. F. Tertulliani' (which we regret to have met elsewhere) is to be deprecated: the writer's real name was Septimius, and the elder Scipio, for example, would be unrecognizable if described as P. C. S. Africanus.

E. EVANS

M. L. W. LAISTNER: *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900*. Second edition. Pp. 416. London: Methuen, 1957. Cloth, 30s. net.

A SECOND edition of this indispensable book has long been awaited by scholars and students. It has been thoroughly revised, but it has lost none of its old charm and ease of style. What is substantially new is of considerable importance—the account of Bede, on whom Professor Laistner is now a leading authority; a revised estimate of Cassiodorus; and invaluable chapters on monastic scriptoria and the knowledge of Greek in the West during the centuries with which the book is concerned. We are able to see how much we owe to Carolingian scribes for the preservation of many classical authors. The bibliographical references are not the least valuable part of the book.

On p. 81, n. 1, Bergman's edition of

Prudentius is described as 'admirable', but it has been severely criticized, apparently with justice; see G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence, 1952), pp. 435 ff. On pp. 86–87 Laistner says that of Boethius's renderings of Aristotle's logical treatises, the *Categorías* and the *De Interpretatione* alone have survived. But it would appear that there are good reasons for believing in the survival of Boethian versions of other of the logical works (the *Topics*, the *Sophistic Elenchi*, and the *Prior Analytics*). We must here take into account the more recent researches of L. Minio-Paluello, conveniently summarized in Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, iii (1956), 70 ff. On p. 331, Commodian is assigned (with a query) to the fifth century. But, apart from other considerations, it seems unlikely that anyone but a third- or early fourth-century writer would have composed a serious poem entitled *Martyrium volenti*. In connexion with Paulinus, patriarch (not merely bishop) of Aquileia, and on the subject of the new rhythmical poetry, associated largely with northern Italy, reference can now be made to Dag Norberg, *La poésie rythmique du haut moyen âge* (Stockholm, 1954), a very important study. I am not sure that Laistner is quite right in rendering *chorepiscopus* (p. 295) by 'suffragan'. This office originated in the East and was really a more or less temporary expedient for dealing with some of the problems of distant and rural parts of a bishop's diocese. Later, such 'bishops' were, we are told, replaced by priests. 'Rural bishops' would be a more accurate translation. Their powers were limited and there were Carolingian ordinances which treated their ordinations of priests and deacons and their consecrations of churches as invalid.

F. J. E. RABY

Jesus College, Cambridge

FREDERIC PEACHY: *Clareti Enigmata. The Latin Riddles of Claret*. Pp. 64. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. Paper, \$1.25.

THIS is No. 7 of a series of 'Folklore Studies', and its primary interest is for folklorists, though it may be recommended also to Latinists whose interest in the language does not end with the close of the classical epoch. Claret (Magister Claretus de Solencia) was a learned fourteenth-century Czech, a monk of the Benedictine order, among whose works is one entitled *Enigmata*. Part of this

consists of 136 riddles in leonine hexameters with an odd vocabulary, due partly to the influence on the author of his native idiom. Peachy has produced an edition of these riddles, giving a critical text (he has, however, normalized the spelling, see pp. 7-8), a free translation, or rather paraphrase, not always very correct, and a commentary which includes parallels and discussions of the sources. Despite linguistic and other difficulties, overcome partly by the help of sundry colleagues, he has produced a useful piece of work. As suggestions on minor points, I mention that the shortening of originally long final *o* is not a medieval licence, but characteristic of Silver Age prosody, notably that of Juvenal (p. 5), and that the 113th riddle, the famous one about the lice, seems to derive ultimately from the *Life of Homer* in all its fuller forms; it is also in the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*.

H. J. ROSE

F. J. E. RAEY: *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*. Second edition. 2 vols. Pp. xii+408, vii+409. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 84s. net.

The first edition of this notable work was published in 1934 and reviewed in *C.R.* xlviii. 236. The new edition has been printed from corrected sheets of the first but the bibliography has been much enlarged and the text and notes revised to take account of recent work. A new appendix deals with the secular pieces in two recently re-edited collections of twelfth- and thirteenth-century lyrics—the Cambridge collection published by Schumann in *Stud. Med.* xvi and the Bodleian 'Bekynnton' collection edited and discussed by Wilmart in *Med. and Ren. St.* i and iv.

P. MAAS: *Textkritik*. 3. Verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Pp. 34. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Paper, DM. 2.30.

THE text of the second edition of Maas's introduction to textual criticism, which was noticed in *C.R.* lxvi (1952), 224, is reproduced in the third edition with trifling changes, but is supplemented by a second appendix and an index. In this appendix, entitled 'Rückblick 1956', Maas observes rather ruefully that sales of his introduction have been more notable than its influence on editors or others who have published studies in textual

criticism since its first appearance in 1927. He attributes its sales to the fact that no other introduction has been published during the last thirty years and its apparent ineffectiveness partly to a deterrent element in its abstract character and partly (though surely with little justification) to inadequacies of his exposition which he would gladly try to make good if scholars would only point them out whether publicly or privately. He then seeks to clarify three points, which are germane to the subject but have rarely hitherto been discussed, by three short excursions headed 'Latente Evidenz', 'Recentiores, Non Deteriores', and 'Diagnostische Konjekturen'. The first and the third supplement what is said respectively in earlier sections about ways in which the dependence or independence of a manuscript may be established and the part that conjecture should play in 'examinatio'. The second title is a quotation from G. Pasquali's introduction to an Italian translation of Maas's second edition. Maas points out that as evidence manuscripts are not 'good' or 'bad' but 'independent' or 'dependent'; manuscripts, however 'good' and however old, proved to be dependent on evidence which is extant or ascertainable without their aid, *comburendi, non conferendi*. The excursions have the same qualities of accurate and concise expression as characterize the rest of the introduction, and although it may be doubted whether they will increase its influence, they and the index are welcome additions.

R. M. RATTENBURY

Trinity College, Cambridge

T. G. SKERT: *The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production*. (From Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xlii.) Pp. 30. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

By what process were multiple copies made of books in the ancient world and in the Middle Ages? Were copies made visually from exemplars or from dictation? In the absence of any clear literary description of this aspect of book production in ancient Greece and Rome and of any representation in extant Greek and Roman art, scholars who have wrestled with this problem have had no sure ground on which to build, and although the matter has been sporadically discussed for at least two centuries, the latest verdict seems to show that an impasse has

been reached. In two interesting lectures delivered as Special University Lectures in Palaeography in the University of London Skeat surveys the history of the dictation theory and sets himself the task of inquiring whether progress can be made by a reassessment of the evidence or by a new line of approach.

Skeat thinks that a minute examination of extant papyri and manuscripts, to which in his view too little attention has hitherto been paid, is most likely to lead to useful results. He first reverts to what he and H. Milne said in their book on Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (1938), and notwithstanding the scepticism with which it was received by reviewers he reiterates the opinion that the manuscript was written from dictation and appends some reasons, which he admits are speculative, why dictation should have been used in the production of this volume. He then adduces a Greek papyrus of the fourth century A.D. and argues that the phonetic and other mistakes, which are of the same nature as those perpetrated by the most inaccurate of the scribes of the Codex Sinaiticus, are on such a scale that it is difficult to imagine how they could have occurred in a visual transcription. From the early Middle Ages he cites an eighth-century manuscript of Orosius's *Historias adversum Paganos* and two early ninth-century manuscripts of the *De Re Rustica* of Columella, which provide texts which seem to him to indicate that the scribes had no visual conception of Latin. In the later Middle Ages it is known that visual copying was the normal method employed for the production of books, and dictation was likely to be used only in exceptional circumstances. Skeat mentions certain manuscripts of the *Divina Commedia* for which visual copying might have been able to cope with the demand, and a thirteenth-century manuscript of the Greek Gospels. Three of the Gospels reflect a pre-Byzantine text; it is suggested that these, which abound in orthographical mistakes, were written from dictation because the exemplar was in an ancient uncial 'which was either too badly damaged or too unfamiliar in script to be easily deciphered'.

Skeat is aware that since it was normal, at any rate in antiquity, for readers to pronounce words as they read them, the prevalence of phonetic mistakes does not in itself provide evidence that a copy was made from dictation; a copyist with an exemplar in front of him might write what he pronounced, not what he saw. He argues, however, that patient accumulation of small details

might reveal differences which would allow visually copied and dictated manuscripts to be distinguished. Although the dictation theory is still unproved either for the Codex Sinaiticus or for the other manuscripts which are adduced, the lectures are stimulating and at any rate put the questions at issue into the right perspective.

R. M. RATTENBURY

Trinity College, Cambridge

ALFONSO TRAINA: *L'alfabeto e la pronunzia del latino*. Pp. 85. Bologna: Riccardo Patron, 1957. Paper, L. 900.

THIS little book is to form part of a preparatory handbook of Latin studies now in course of preparation by the Seminario di Filologia Classica of the University of Padua. Disclaiming originality, it provides an agreeable and generally sound account of the history of the Latin alphabet and the names of its letters, of the vicissitudes suffered by Latin pronunciation in different countries from the early Middle Ages to the present time, and of the evidence for a number of features of the ancient pronunciation. The author has in mind also the practical question of the pronunciation most suitable for present-day teachers and students, a question of which the solution, in his opinion, requires knowledge of the historical facts, even if these are not the only factors to be considered.

There are a few details which should be clarified or corrected before the book assumes its final shape. For example, the form, especially in early texts, of the Etruscan sign for *F* does not favour the view that it originated in the digraph FH with omission of the first sign (p. 12). An early Latin use of *Z* to denote the voiced sibilant preceding rhotacism (p. 14; Traina admits that positive evidence is lacking) is most improbable, in view of the fact that the Oscan alphabet uses its *Z* for the sound-group *ts*, its *S* for both voiced and voiceless sibilant. In the history of the Latin signs for velars (pp. 11-12) it should be noted that the central question is why the Romans (unlike Oscans and Umbrians) rejected the use of *K* except before *A*. Traina seems not always at home in phonetics, general or historical. He gives a misleading account of the accusative plural endings of *ā*-stems and *ō*-stems (p. 52); he regards as part of the same historical process the reduction of the group *-rx* to *-rs* and that of *-x* to *-(s)s* (p. 54). His observations on *lautus/lotus*, besides being etymologically uncertain, assign the meaning



'raffinato' to the wrong member of the pair (p. 33).

In general Traina's treatment is judicious and well balanced. He has, for example, an excellent if brief discussion of the controversial *sonus medius* (pp. 36 ff.). He makes a number of points effectively. Writing for Italians, he neatly marks the inconsistency of a school Latin which uses approximately the pronunciation of St. Augustine, the orthography of Quintilian, and the syntax and vocabulary of Cicero (p. 55). He is aware, too, that no reconstructed pronunciation can convey the quality of the living speech, the *anima vocis* of which he speaks on p. 33. He could nevertheless have brought his readers closer to it by including some topics which he does not mention, or dismisses with the merest recognition of their relevance (pp. 33, 59). He does no more than allude to the rhythm of word and sentence (accent, vowel-quantity, iambic shortening, etc.), and says nothing of vowel-syncope, of final -s and -m, of such features of word-junction as elision, synaloephe, apocope of -s. It may be that these topics are barred by his plan of treating only those aspects in which the classical pronunciation differs most markedly from that current in Italy. Even so, place should have been found for the difference in timbre between *ē* and *ē̄*, *ō* and *ō̄* respectively which the Italian practice ignores.

The usefulness of the book is greatly enhanced by no fewer than four indexes (words, ancient sources, names, technical terms) and in particular by lavish bibliographies, which not only give the most important literature for the subject of each paragraph, but contain further observations and brief indications of important views and controversies.

D. M. JONES

Westfield College, London

JACQUES HEURGON: *Trois études sur le 'Ver sacrum'*. (Collection Latomus, Vol. xxvi.) Pp. 52. Brussels: Latomus, 1957. Paper, 80 B. fr.

THIS valuable monograph examines not only the *ver sacrum* in general but three instances of it, or at least approximations to it, whereof one at least is fully historical. A *ver sacrum*, Heurgon holds (p. 7), consists of two, if not three, distinct elements. The first is the consecration, on the occasion of a famine or some such disaster, of the entire produce, vegetable and animal, the latter including human, of the next year (*ver*,

properly the name of the most productive season, having this extended meaning, which is why Greek authors represent it by *ἐνιαυτός*). The second is the disposition of the human element; being the absolute property of Mars, the regular recipient of the offering, they are nevertheless not put to death, like the beasts, but sent away when they are old enough, to found a colony or otherwise get a new home outside the bounds of their original state. A third element, not in itself necessary, is their guidance to the destined site by one of Mars' creatures, as bull or woodpecker. He denies (p. 9) that any real equivalent of this custom can be found among other peoples, including those of Indo-Germanic speech, despite the assertion of Strabo (v. 4. 12, p. 250) that 'certain of the Greeks' have done the same thing.

He now examines the three instances. The first is Cato's account of the founding of the *lucus Feroniae*, preserved by Servius on *Aen.* vii. 697, if, with A. Wagener, we supply *iuvenes* after *Veientum*, as indeed seems necessary to make sense and grammar. A king, apparently of Veii, having the unlikely name Propertius, 'sent' these young persons *cum adolevisent* to Capena, i.e., presumably, to found it. Heurgon doubts if this be genuinely Etruscan tradition, and prefers to suppose that it originates with the Sabines, neighbours of the Etruscans in that region and their allies against Rome on occasion.

He next (pp. 20-35) discusses the very strange story told by Festus (p. 150 Lindsay) on the authority of 'Alfius', supposedly the minor poet Alfius Flavius, that the ancestors of the Mamertines were warned in a dream by Apollo to institute a *ver sacrum* in honour of him, not of Mars, and that the consequent migration placed them (using Cichorius' emendation of Festus' text) in *parte ea Si(lae silvae) quae <adhu>c Tauricana dicitur*, where they became the neighbours and benefactors of the Messanians, a remarkable distortion of the facts and an equally remarkable displacement of the native by the foreign god. Heurgon examines with profit the influence of Greek on Mamertine cults, as shown by their coinage, and the predominance of Apollo over Mars in the later issues.

Lastly the famous Roman vow of 217 is dealt with (pp. 36-51). Much of this material is very familiar and therefore passed over briefly, but an interesting and I think new point is made (pp. 45 ff.) when discussing the decree of the Senate in 194 that the final payment, so to call it, to Jupiter should consist of those animals which were born between 1 March and the end of April. This, as Heurgon sees it, at one stroke did

Mars a courtesy, since his month was involved, and minimized the expense to the owners of beasts, for in the then state of the calendar the real (Julian) dates were about 2 Dec. 194-31 Jan. 193, when the increase of the flocks and herds would be negligible, pp. 48-50.

On p. 23, *dialectales* seems a printer's error for *dialectales*, and on p. 50, ought not *créancier* to be *débiteur*?

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

C. W. WESTRUP: *Some Notes on the Roman Slave in Early Times*. A comparative sociological study. (K. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Hist.-fil. Meddelelser, Bind 36, no. 3.) Pp. 25. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1956. Paper, Kr. 4.

THE main purpose of this brief work is to attack 'the current doctrine' according to which 'the slave was from of old, though a human being, legally considered a *thing* in the proper sense of the word, i.e. without any legal personality. He had consequently no rights.' This, in the author's view, is 'no doubt altogether wrong'. He cites the slave's sharing in the domestic *sacra*, his capacity to become free by manumission, the XII Tables penalty for injury to a slave (half that for injury to a free man), the possibility, later, of *iniuria* to a slave, the existence of the *peculium*, &c. The answer to this seems to be twofold. First, the author sometimes overstates his case—e.g. Gaius (iii. 222) is emphatic that a slave cannot himself suffer *iniuria* but only his master through him, and then only if 'aperte in contumeliam domini fieri videtur' (he points to the difference in this between slaves and sons). Secondly, the 'current doctrine' hardly bears the construction put upon it. For example, Buckland's *Textbook* (2nd ed., 1932, pp. 62 ff.): 'Slaves were both things and men or persons. . . . The dispute, such as it is, is in fact about words (as is evident from the sense in which Buckland uses 'persons'). What is meant by 'legal personality', by 'having no rights'? If a right involves the capacity in its subject to enforce it in the courts, then a slave had no rights. In this the protection in the XII Tables of the slave against injury differs from the protection of the free man; in this the *peculium* of the slave differs from ordinary property rights, and so on. But the argument is barren. The important thing to notice, and this paper is useful in collecting together the evidence, is the anomalous position of the

slave, enjoying what may be called, if a label be needed, 'social rights' but not legal rights. This is particularly marked in the attitude to the *peculium*.

BARRY NICHOLAS

Brasenose College, Oxford

J. M. HUSSEY: *The Byzantine World*. Pp. 191. London: Hutchinson, 1957. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

It is no mean feat to give a complete picture of Byzantine civilization in less than 200 pages, and for the modest price of 10s. 6d. There have been various attempts during the last half-century to describe Byzantium in one volume, but, with the exception of Professor Baynes's *Byzantine Empire* published thirty-two years ago, none has been so concise or so successful as Professor Hussey's; and her work is both shorter and more complete than Baynes's, which, for all its brilliance, is weighted in favour of the earlier centuries and regards the period after 1204 as being hardly Byzantine at all. Not quite half of Hussey's book consists of a well-balanced summary of Byzantine history, which she divides into four periods, 'The Byzantine Empire takes shape, 342-717', 'The Medieval Roman Empire, 717-1056', 'Fundamental Changes, 1025-1204', and 'The Impact of East and West, 1204-1453'. The first and third periods are given proportionately the fullest treatment, probably rightly, though one may regret that the Nicæan Emperors are passed over so very briefly and their importance is hinted at rather than stated. There follow three excellent chapters on the Church, 'Church and State', 'The Christian Life and the Laity', and 'The Monastic World', of which the third is particularly to be recommended. In the first of these chapters some of her statements may arouse disagreement with other Byzantine scholars; though she is scrupulously careful to admit the existence of other views and to avoid too categorical opinions, it is possible that Byzantine theories on the subject were even less precise and more fluid than she allows. But her knowledge of and sympathy with Byzantine religion make her an excellent guide. The chapter on everyday life is regrettable only for its brevity. Hussey feels that the time has not yet come for a general social history of Byzantium. We may hope that when it does come she will write it. The remaining chapters, on Learning and Literature, on Art, and on Byzantium and its Neighbours, all suffer from being a little too concise, but

provide an admirable introduction to each of their subjects. There are a few brief but useful bibliographical notes at the end of the book.

It is a pity that Hussey has not had the space to tell us much, except incidentally, about the administration and the commerce of the Empire; but to do so would have required a far longer book. As it is, the book is remarkable for its good sense and its clarity of writing; and there could not be a better introduction to Byzantine studies.

STEVEN RUNCIMAN

London

G. M. DURANT: *Journey into Roman Britain*. Pp. viii+264; 24 plates, 25 line drawings. London: Bell, 1957. Cloth, 20s. net.

In a modest foreword Mrs. Durant notes that her book is addressed to the ordinary public, including older schoolboys and girls, and not for scholars; in that respect her book at once invites comparison with Jessie Mothersole's excursions into Roman Britain, but the comparison is not very favourable. Miss Mothersole took care to get specialists to vet her text, and was always at pains to give a full bibliography, so that those who wished could turn to works of greater detail; and the accuracy on which Mrs. Durant takes pride proves on examination to be something less than complete. Yet the lay public may well find her book enjoyable, and its half-tones (two-thirds of them by the author) include a number which will not be familiar to all readers—though the plans and other drawings in line are not of the standard which one expects from a modern publisher. The book deals in a pleasantly discursive way with military and civil sites, working in a good deal of the history of Roman Britain; it does not appear how recently the author has visited all the places which she describes (for example, it seems odd that the Housesteads museum is described as 'a little shed', twenty years after the opening of Mr. Austin Child's excellent stone building); and it would have added something if her itinerary had taken her north of Hadrian's Wall. But the readers for whom it was intended will probably not notice the book's shortcomings, and if some of them are inspired by it to seek a fuller knowledge of fortresses or forts, towns or villas or museums, it has ample suggestions to make; and it adds National Grid references to the names of the

principal places which it has occasion to mention.

ERIC BIRLEY

Hatfield College, Durham

MANUEL MARÍN Y PEÑA: *Instituciones Militares Romanas*. (Enciclopedia Clásica, vol. 2.) Pp. xxvi+511; 24 plates, map. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956. Cloth.

THIS is a conscientious and methodical survey of the Roman armed forces, their organization and methods, from the earliest times until the fourth century; issued as one volume in a classical encyclopaedia, it is subdivided into 1,074 paragraphs (to which its general index and index of names refer), its 26 chapters each furnished with an appropriate bibliography, often taking into account papers which not every specialist may have come across. The compiler has read very widely, and has been at great pains to inform himself about the latest views of American, British, French, Italian, and German scholars, though one does not get the impression that he has had occasion to attempt original research into any portion of the field; but no doubt the scope of the series did not call for more than he has performed with remarkable competence, except perhaps that Chapter 24, devoted to Roman *limites*, cites nothing more recent than the mid-1920's. A comparable volume in English would undoubtedly be of real value to undergraduates or to schoolmasters.

ERIC BIRLEY

Hatfield College, Durham

GIOVANNI VITUCCI: *Ricerche sulla praefectura urbi in età imperiale (sec. i-iii)*. Pp. 124. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1956. Paper, L.1,800.

VITUCCI's starting-point is the origin of the urban prefecture as an organ of imperial government. He believes that the *praefectus urbi* of the principate was not in any sense a lineal descendant of his ancient namesake but a development of the revolutionary prefects of Caesar (who no longer represented absent imperium but an absent potentate), an innovation (under a light camouflage) made by Augustus, who is to be credited even with the final step of giving permanency to the office. The novelty and the relevance of Caesar's *praefecti* are clearly

illuminating conceptions here, which have not, it seems, received sufficient notice in the past. Augustus's part also deserved re-examination. Maecenas, whatever his title, clearly set a precedent for connecting the representative of the absent potentate with the maintenance of civil order. In the Augustan world that order was to be policed by the urban cohorts, for whose establishment Vitucci accepts the date 27 B.C.; and he argues that it was precisely in order to provide a supreme commander for those cohorts after his departure from Rome in 26 B.C. that Augustus appointed Messalla Corvinus, the first of the new-style prefects, as it was precisely the existence of the cohorts that led Messalla to regard his post as *incivilis* and to resign it rapidly; subsequently the cohorts were dealt with otherwise in Augustus' absences except for the brief re-appearance of the prefect (Statilius Taurus) in 16 B.C.; but in A.D. 13 came, unexpected and inexplicable in the state of the evidence, the appointment of an urban prefect to operate despite the presence of the *princeps* in the city, no longer therefore of necessity on a temporary basis and therefore presumably on a permanent one. The argument turns in the first place on two controversial dates, 27 B.C. for the establishment of the urban cohorts and A.D. 13 for the appointment of L. Calpurnius Piso. The former will still seem difficult to some in view of the apparently unchecked rioting in Rome that called for Agrippa's presence in 21 B.C.; and it is surely the case that Messalla's attitude can be perfectly well explained without the cohorts, for his relation to the regular magistrates of the newly restored Republic could not but be embarrassingly anomalous. The latter too has failed to convince many, and even those who accept it might wonder whether the appointment was not simply an arrangement intended for the temporary convenience of a very old *princeps* rather than a considered and permanent addition to the administration of the city. Not that either suggestion is unattractive, of course. It is just possible that a further advance might have been made as a result of more analysis of the situations in Rome in which Augustus did, or did not, decide to appoint urban prefects. And the view of A. H. M. Jones (*J.H.S.* xli [1951], p. 118) on the relation of the first two appointments to Augustus' consular imperium might have been mentioned.

In later chapters Vitucci outlines the developments of the jurisdiction of the prefect, assigning to Septimius Severus an important definition of these and especially

a territorial limitation within a radius of 100 miles of the city. He has perhaps not given enough attention to the almost inevitable activity in this direction by M. Aurelius after his introduction of *irridici* in Italy. He also demolishes at some length Durry's suggestion that the cohorts and their prefect were ever regarded as a bulwark of the senatorial interest. His final chapter consists in a useful list of *praefecti urbi* from 26 B.C. to A.D. 254 based on the latest epigraphic and prosopographical literature.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Newnham College,  
Cambridge

RACHEL SARGENT ROBINSON: *Sources for the History of Greek Athletics*. In English translation, with Introductions, Notes, Bibliography, and Indexes. Pp. xii+289. Obtainable from Dr. Robinson at 338 Probasco Street, Cincinnati 20, Ohio. Paper, \$4.25 post free.

SOME thirty years ago Dr. Robinson compiled a series of translations of source material for the use of students attending Professor Oldfather's course on Greek Athletics at the University of Illinois. The compilation proved popular, and was soon issued as a 'brochure' entitled *The Story of Greek Athletics*. The present work is an expanded version of the original source-book with some new chapters, many additional translations, much fuller annotations, and a select bibliography. It should be noted that the collection of sources, though extensive, is not, and does not claim to be, exhaustive.

Robinson's method is to display the main features in the rise and spread of Greek athletics by a series of extracts translated from a variety of sources, chiefly literary, but including some inscriptional and papyrological evidence. Her nine chapters carry the story from the funeral games of the heroic age through the growing professionalism of classical and Hellenistic times right down to the third century A.D. The book is thus something of a history as well as a collection of sources. The order of treatment is chronological, and there are brief introductions to put each period and passage in perspective and enable the work to be read as a continuous account. This 'snapshot' technique conveys a vivid and authentic impression of athletics as seen through the often critical eyes of ancient poets, historians, philosophers,



physicians, and statesmen. But though Pindar and Theocritus can convey a good deal of the spirit of the ancient contests, the student will not clearly grasp the techniques of boxing and wrestling without recourse to the evidence of vase-painting or sculpture. Here the work suffers by comparison with a text-book such as Gardiner's *Athletics of the Ancient World*, for it contains no pictorial material.

Many of the translations are taken from published versions, but a considerable number are the writer's own, notably the extensive extracts from Philostratus on *Gymnastics* and Galen on *Exercise with the Small Ball*. These follow the originals closely, and are clear and reliable for the most part, though occasionally somewhat rough and lacking in elegance.

In introducing the extracts Robinson writes with verve and imagination. Cleisthenes announces a 'Son-in-Law Contest'; Democedes appears as 'Dr. Democedes, leading specialist of his day'; Eusebius is engaged on 'several immense research projects', and so on. Such campus idiom may grate on the ears of Old World scholars, but Robinson is not open to the charge of pedantry, and it must be allowed that she manages to convey to the reader a good deal of her own enthusiasm for her subject.

I have noted a number of minor errors and inconsistencies. For example, the *Drignosophistae* is variously referred to as *Doctors at Dinner* (p. 88), *Doctors for Dinner* (p. 146), *Sophists at Dinner* (p. 184). Hippas of Elis is placed in the 'fifth century B.C.' (p. 39), but the compilation of his *Olympic Register* is later assigned to the fourth century (p. 255). On p. 141, *P. Oxy.* 222 is said to be 'cited in Chapter IV above', but actually appears only as a reference in a note on p. 252. On p. 53, the Apollodorus tentatively dated to the first century A.D. is surely the famous chronographer of the second century B.C.

There is no Greek type, and the litho-printing process apparently did not allow even the use of italics. The eye is therefore from time to time confronted with words like *periodonikes* and *paidotribes*. But when allowance has been made for this, one can say that the book as a whole provides an interesting introduction to the subject of Greek athletics, and forms a useful supplement to the standard histories.

J. V. LUCE

Trinity College, Dublin

*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vol. xiv, ed. A. G. WOODHEAD. Pp. xiii+232. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1957. Paper, fl. 46.

VOL. xiv of *S.E.G.* appears with commendable speed on the heels of its immediate predecessors, and my recent review of the earlier volumes (*C.R.* vii [1957], 136-9) makes it unnecessary to dwell further on general points beyond saying that this volume has (in general) the appearance of having been prepared with greater care. It contains in all 900 items, of which approximately one-third (1-296) are Attic, while Caria also claims a good share (638-737) and Delphi accounts for 77 entries. The Attic items consist predominantly of corrections to previously published inscriptions by D. M. Lewis and Peek (of these, particularly the former are not of much use as reprinted here, since the corrections depend largely on detailed epigraphical observation, of which no indication is given here: perhaps a more practical solution would have been to give, as in other cases—see below—a list of the inscriptions treated by Lewis), and of the instalment from the Agora published by Meritt in *Hesperia*, 1954. The Carian items comprise the second instalment of Caunian inscriptions (for the first see *S.E.G.*, xii. 461 ff.), published by Bean in *J.H.S.*, 1954, and those published in Fraser and Bevan, *The Rhodian Peraea*. A few points of detail may be noticed. 469: to the bibliography add *Gnomon* xxvi (1954) 249, where the inscription was first recorded. 475: a reference to P. R. Franke, *Alt-Epirus u. das Königstum der Molosser* (1955) would be valuable here, since Franke provides a detailed discussion of the inscriptions of the Molossian kingdom. 483: neither the original editor nor Woodhead seems to have noticed that this is *S.G.D.I.* 3058. In spite of Bechtel's observation ad loc., 'Μενδίδωπον: der Name ist nicht zu ändern', I am inclined to agree with Böeckh that we should read (B)μενδίδωπον, even if the agreement of two copies suggests very strongly that *Μενδίδωπον* was inscribed. 488: to the bibliography add Kocevlov, *Wuz. Jahrb.* iii (1948), 169 ff., and, for the date, E. I. Levy, *Sov. Arch.* ix (1947), 89 ff. 609: this was republished in the B.M. Catalogue of Terracottas; see *J.E.A.*, xlii (1956), 112, no. (36) (where for '8541' read '8514'). 741: *Milet*, i. vii. 202 is republished as Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, 51. Apropos of Sokolowski, it is a pity that Woodhead, who is so lavish with concordances, indexes, etc., of recently published

corpora, etc.—as, for example, his surely quite unnecessary repetition of the tables of contents of *I.G.L.S.*, iii as *S.E.G.*, xiii, 593, and of *I.G.L.S.*, iv as *S.E.G.*, xiv, 820—does not include references to the items republished, and often improved, in Sokolowski's extremely useful book (with the valuable review of Tod, *Gnomon*, xxviii (1956), 455–61). However, Woodhead may not have seen the work in time for this volume.

P. M. FRASER

All Souls College, Oxford

THEODORE V. BUTTREY: *The Triumviral Portrait Gold of the Quattuorviri Monetales of 42 B.C.* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 137.) Pp. x+69; 9 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1956. Paper, \$2.

ABOUT the date and relationship of the four moneyers, P. Clodius, L. Livineius Regulus, L. Mussidius Longus, and C. Vibius Varus, opinion has varied; sometimes they have been grouped as a college, sometimes separated and allotted to years as far apart as 43 and 38 B.C. Moreover, it has long been observed that some of their gold portrait issues for the *Triumviri* are linked together by the use of common obverse dies; on this basis the present study sets out to prove formally and incontrovertibly that the four moneyers form a collegium, and that they held office in 42 B.C.

Prima facie the five gold issues of these moneyers are united by their use of portraits of the *Triumviri* as obverse types; the occurrence of die-links makes the unity closer still. But a single die-link between two issues does not give the decisive proof which the author requires, because dies could survive and be re-used after a number of years. Therefore, records of over 100 specimens of these rare aurei are assembled, and each coin is minutely examined for traces of damage in the dies to determine the order of striking.

One result is to show that Varus and Longus were certainly colleagues, for the obverse dies prove that issues were struck for all three *Triumviri* in the order (1) Longus (*rev.* Mars), (2) Varus, (3) Longus (*rev.* cornucopiae). It is also demonstrated that Clodius struck his issues earlier than Longus and Varus, and shared certain dies with them. Regulus, on the other hand, shares no portrait dies with the other three. On the level of the absolute proof which the author

is seeking, his association with them is perhaps weak, though there can be little doubt that he is correctly identified as the fourth member of the collegium of 42 B.C.

This study usefully demonstrates what can be done by minute analysis, but the argument is complex and the reader's path is not always made as easy as it might have been. To master the confusing system of abbreviated die descriptions, on which the intelligibility of the text depends, requires a considerable feat of memorization. The use of italic type for reverse dies would have provided a welcome distinguishing mark; diagrams might have clarified passages of argument which are baffling as they stand, and a few enlargements included in the comprehensive plates would have made plain the deterioration of the most significant dies. But at least it can now be said that the moneyers of 42 B.C. are securely identified.

C. M. KRAAY

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

SYDNEY P. NOE: *Two Hoards of Persian Sigloi.* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 136.) Pp. 45; 15 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1956. Paper, \$2.

THE two hoards here described came on the market in 1950 and 1952, and are now preserved, at least in part, in the collection of the American Numismatic Society; both appear to have been found in Asia Minor. Hoard I (254 coins) is restricted to sigloi on which the King carries both bow and spear. Its most remarkable feature is the small number of reverse punches represented; apart from twenty-seven single specimens all from different punches, only six more punches appear on the remaining 227 coins. Both condition and the presence of countermarks show that these are not uncirculated lots received straight from the mint; but it is at least likely that the large numbers of coins with identical punches are a sign of the proximity of the find spot to the issuing mint. It is all the more unfortunate that the exact provenance is not known.

Hoard II, said to have been discovered in 1945, was apparently large, for sections have already been published by Robinson (*Nism. Chron.*, 1947, p. 173) and Seyrig (in Schlumberger, *L'Argent grec dans l'empire achéménide*, p. 55). A further 642 coins are published here, of which Croeseid half-staters account

for nearly one-third; in the remaining two-thirds three types of siglos are represented: (1) King shooting, (2) half-length King, and (3) King with bow and spear. As in Hoard I there are again considerable groups of coins from single reverse punches. Countermarks occur less frequently than in Hoard I, and are much commoner on the Croeseids than on the sigloi.

Metrologically the two hoards are distinct. The mass of coins in Hoard II (Croeseids and sigloi alike) fall between 5.30 and 5.40 gm., whereas in Hoard I the norm is between 5.50 and 5.60 gm. Since bow-and-spear sigloi occur for both standards, the change must have been made in the course of this prolonged issue. The community in weight between Croeseids and sigloi in Hoard II is sufficient to show that it is the earlier of the two hoards.

Unfortunately little evidence is forthcoming on the vexed question of absolute chronology or on the relationship of the Croeseid to the siglos. Noe argues that the issue of Croeseids must have ceased in 546 on the downfall of Croesus; and, since the condition of the Croeseids in Hoard II is comparable to that of the most worn sigloi, he concludes 'that there would seem to have been little or no considerable break after the death of Croesus before coining the sigloi was started. They might even have begun before 546' (p. 43). But surely the alternative view deserves consideration, that Croeseids continued to be produced in Lydia by the Persians until such time as the daric and siglos were introduced (presumably by Darius I). The presence of Croeseids and Greek coins in the Persepolis foundation deposit, dated 515, suggests that at that time there was still no native Persian coinage.

An interesting discussion of the methods of coining sigloi is included. The excellent series of plates reproduces a large number of the coins as well as giving useful enlargements of selected specimens of both coins and countermarks.

C. M. KRAAY

*Ashmolean Museum, Oxford*

**HERBERT KOCH:** *Von ionischer Baukunst*. Pp. 23; 33 figs. Köln: Böhlau, 1956. Stiff paper, DM. 4.80.

THIS little essay flits lightly from one topic to another—the difference between Ionic and Doric architecture, the Erechtheum, and the development of the Ionic capital. In its casual way it shows much learning and some sense. The style of writing is easy.

What readers Koch has in mind I cannot say, but no doubt they will be delighted.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

**R. LULLIES and M. HIRMER:** *Greek Sculpture*. Pp. 88; 264 plates (8 in colour), 11 figs. London: Thames and Hudson, 1957. Cloth, 63s. net.

As a self-contained introduction to Greek sculpture this is the best book yet published. The illustrations are well conceived and produced, and generous in size and number. Hirmer, who took most of the photographs, shows by his lighting and views a proper understanding of his subjects; and since they are almost all originals, the quality of Greek workmanship is unusually well displayed. Perhaps too many plates are allotted to Archaic and too few to Hellenistic, and the coloured photographs of bronzes, though impressive, give a false impression because of the patination. But even specialists should be grateful for these admirable pictures.

Lullies's text is scholarly and intelligible to the layman, in spite of its rather lush and abstract style. It consists of a general introduction that is closely related to the illustrations and of critical and descriptive notes of each work illustrated. It would be niggling to argue about minor points in so summary an account, though it may usefully be noted that the stele of Aristion (pl. 68) has lost also the high crest of the helmet. More general criticisms are that too much is made of the differences between schools, anyhow in a work of this scope, and that the course of Hellenistic sculpture is not so simple as it appears here. On the whole Lullies is unsympathetic to Hellenistic art and his account of modern taste (pp. 12–13) is not quite fair, though the final comment on the Laocöon has (probably without intention) a cynical candour. The classified bibliography should help readers who wish to learn more, especially if they know German.

The translation cannot have been easy, and Michael Bullock has made a brave attempt. He seems nearly always to have understood the sense of the German, though his renderings are sometimes clumsy and stilted. Where he has come to grief is in his ignorance of terms, literary and archaeological, English as well as German. So 'Alexandrian' refers to the reign of Alexander, 'Hellenism' to the Hellenistic period; 'Ptolemeans' serves for 'Ptolemies'; and he invents 'Aeginian', 'Pergamonian', and so

on. There are also 'Ionian islands', which appears frequently but refers to the Cyclades, a new ethnic 'Toreutian' (p. 50), and—delectably—'the so-called female Hercules' (p. 73): presumably these are renderings of 'insel-ionisch', 'Toreutiker' and 'die sg. Herculanenserinnen'. It is a pity that the publishers did not spend a few pounds more to have the translation checked by some English-speaking student of classical archaeology. Faults of this kind are unnecessary, and may prejudice readers against the great merits of this book.

The paper and printing are good. Misprints are few. The binding is not too strong for so heavy a volume. The price is very reasonable. This is a book which has a wide appeal, and it should certainly be in all libraries.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

ADOLF GREIFENHAGEN: *Griechische Erosen*. Pp. 89; 54 figs. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1957. Cloth, DM. 14.

EROS is one of those lesser divinities that evade neat definition, and Greifenhagen has taken care not to involve himself too much in theories. The basis of this little book is in its illustrations, mostly chosen from Attic red-figure vases of the first half of the sixth century, when artists showed Eros at his best. Greifenhagen cites texts from literature, but is too honest to force correspondences with art, which has its own canons. Generally his comments are shrewd, though I feel doubtful whether, for example, the appearance of a lion on the astragal of Fig. 19 or the frequency of Eros on red-figure lekythoi is evidence that vase-painters connected this godling with death. *Griechische Erosen* is a pleasantly discursive essay, the production is admirable, and the photographs are excellent and well chosen. Students of Eros should enjoy and profit by this book.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

HEINRICH DRERUP: *Zum Ausstattungsluxus in der römischen Architektur*. (Orbis Antiquus, 11.) Pp. 37; 7 plates. Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1957. Paper, DM. 3.50.

THE intentions and achievements of Roman

architectural decorators are less popular with students than they long were. Yet there are few subjects which could afford more help to our groping contemporary designers. One therefore welcomes this serious and very learned attempt by a great authority to recover the form and spirit of architectural luxury in the High Empire.

Drerup concludes that normally Roman moralists condemned luxury only on private, not on public, buildings. Statius and even Virgil had no true eye for architecture, only for the effect of rich materials—unlike even the later Greeks, such as Lucian, whose essay *περί τοῦ οἴκου* betrays an eye for aesthetic qualities, and Plutarch, who in *Poplicola* 15 condemns Domitian's Capitol. Drerup goes farther, and urges that Roman artists themselves preferred large shimmering areas of metal and semi-precious stones to the structural articulation and plain marbles preferred by the Greeks. In the First Pompeian Style, as Scheffold rightly observed, artists already obtained their effects by obvious veneering; and the unstructural Second Style was condemned only by Vitruvius, and only as an Hellenist. Roman 'Metalluxus', the antithesis of Classical Greek decoration, could come, perhaps, either from Old Oriental decoration transmitted through the pavilions of Hellenistic kings, or from Etruria. Drerup prefers the latter source. For (1) we hear of metallic luxury-buildings in Rome, like the Porticus Octavia (168 A.D.), years before the first known appearance there of Greek marble. (2) The terracotta revetments of Etruscan temples suggest metal finials and brattishing; while in other features they recall the Roman practice of hanging vast spoils on all their public and even their private buildings (see the Tomba dei Rilievi for displays of armour inside the house). (3) Late Republican stage-buildings of glass, metal, and precious stones, described in Pliny, *N.H.*, suggest to Drerup the technique he has envisaged on Etruscan temples. Such a frontispiece must have earned Pompey's theatre its special fame, and dazzled the decorators of the Early Empire.

But, to convince this reviewer, Drerup must overcome various objections. Surely Vitruvius condemned the Third, not the Second Pompeian Style (though Maiuri, too, thinks he disliked the Second). Moreover, he represents the Greek Apatouria as practising the Third Style at Tralles (vii. 5, 5). Self-confessed veneering is surely not as old as the First Pompeian Style. Even on the Pantheon, apart from a few roundels, the



veneer imitates solid masonry. True incrustation, of the sort described by Ruskin in his masterly account of St. Mark's (to which I refer Schefold and Drerup), is surely rare before the Lower Empire. 'Metalluxus' probably distinguished Classical Greek temple-cellas, and is no Italic invention. According to Pliny, *N.H.* xxxiv. 13, the bronze capitals of the Porticus Octavia gave it its nickname of 'Corinthian', bronze roof-tiles were apparently called 'Syracusan' and famous Syracusan bronze capitals were placed by Agrippa in the Pantheon. None of this points to central Italy as the true home of 'Metalluxus'. Displays of armour enlivened Greek domestic interiors, at least in the periods represented by *Odyssey* i and the famous fragment of Alcaeus. No one tells us that Pompey's theatre was famous chiefly for a meretricious frontispiece. It is the earliest Roman building of *opus reticulatum* and, of course, the first permanent Roman theatre, and it was also known to Greek connoisseurs (Plutarch, *Pompey* 42) for its form and proportions.

I cannot feel that Drerup has discovered any Italic ancestry for the more important decorative features of the High Imperial style. But he certainly compels us to think more closely than we have done on this important subject.

HUGH PLOMMER

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

*Hommages à Waldemar Deonna.*  
(Collection Latomus, xxviii.) Pp. 539; 69 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1957. Paper, 1,000 B. fr.

M. AMAND, Contribution à l'étude de la voirie antique au sud-ouest de Tournai; A. André, Un portrait de Tibère à la Villa San Michele, Anacapri; J. Babelon, Sur un tétradrachme de Gortyne; A. A. Barb, Abraxas-Studien; H. Bardon, Souvenirs latins; G. Bendinelli, Un problema inerente al gruppo delle 'Danzatrici' della Colonna in Delfi; F. Benoit, Traditions païennes dans l'iconographie romaine — Epona au tabouret; H. Biévelet, L'exploration archéologique de Bavi; J. Charbonneaux, Sarapis et Isis et la double corne d'abondance; E. Condurachi, Bronze antique du Musée d'Art de Bucarest — une nouvelle

rélique d'Atalante?; G. Daux, Mys au Ptoion (Hérod. viii. 135); S. J. de Laet, Bol en terre sigillée trouvé à Lyon et conservé à Baltimore; M. Delcourt, Horatius Cocles et Mucius Scaevola; P. Dimitrov, Neuentdeckte epigraphische Denkmäler über die Religion der Thraker in der frühhellenistischen Epoche; G. Dossin, Le Fleuve Araxe-Bactre-Halmos; R. Dussaud, Les *dii patrii* de Lepcis; G. Faider-Feytmans, Objets de bronze découverts à Maestricht; S. Ferri, Apollo Sminteo e Apollo di Vei; G. Florescu, Le problème du médaillon dans l'art gréco-romain; J. Gagé, La poutre sacrée des Horatii — le 'Tigillum sororium'; A. Garcia y Bellido, Isis y el *Collegium Illychinariorum* del *Pratum novum*; A. Grenier, La date du Capitole de Narbonne; P. Grimal, Vénus et l'immortalité (Tib. i. 3. 37 ff.); L. Hermann, Musée et l'Énéide; J. Hubaux, Les souhaits de l'amant délaissé (Prop.); J. H. C. Kern, Two Attic black-figured Skyphoi in Leyden; J. Klement, Das erste Baldachin auf dem römischen Zivilfirdhof im Sempeter in Sannale; M. Labrousse, Antefixes en terre cuite du Quercy; L. Lacroix, *Ikmalios*; P. Lambrechts, L'importance de l'enfant dans les religions à mystère; R. Lantier, Une nouvelle image d'Epona; M. Leglay, Le serpent dans les cultes africains; S. Mollard-Beaques, Portrait d'un Ptolémée? — Tête en terre cuite de Smyrne; G. Mylonas, Une amphore du peintre de la Chimère; C. Picard, D'un tesson arrétin trouvé à S. Bertrand de Comminges à l'un des *skyphoi* d'argent du trésor d'Hoby; G. C. Picard, Une mosaïque pythagoricienne à El Djem; M. T. Picard, La *thoraké* d'Amasis; J. G. Préaux, Saturne à l'ouoboros; M. Renard, Miroir étrusque inédit de la collection P. Desneux; G. M. A. Richter, Were there Greek *Armara*?; D. M. Robinson, A lost Cretan decree found; E. Thevenot, La pendaison sanglante des victimes offertes à Esus-Mars; R. Thouvenot, Buste de Sérapis trouvé en Maurétanie Tingitane; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Genii Cucullati* in Roman Britain; D. Tsonchev, Le culte d'Hécate à Philippolis; R. van Compernelle, Les Deinoménides et le culte de Déméter et Koré à Gela; B. van de Walle, Le temple égyptien d'après Strabon, xvii. 28; C. C. van Esen, A propos du plan de la ville d'Ostie; M. J. Vermaseren, Sole o Medusa? un intaglio romano; W. Vollgraff, Les *eryfi* des inscriptions mithraïques; T. B. L. Webster, Demeter at Pylos.

# SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

## DIONISO

### XIX (New Series), 3-4 (1956)

A. Pertusi, *Selezione teatrale e scelta erudita nella tradizione del testo di Euripide*, ii: *Reperitorio teatrale e scelta erudita*: the groups of nine and of ten plays represent selections made in the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C. and the 4th-5th centuries A.D. respectively; in both theatrical tradition was more influential than scholastic or rhetorical principles. F. C. Görschen, *Die Hypothesis zu Aischylos' Aitnainai*: examines Pap. Ox. xx. 2257, fr. 1, especially vv. 1-7, and concludes with a text and Latin paraphrase of the whole fragment. D. Bindzus, *Griechische Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Olg des Staatlichen Gymnasiums zu Flensburg 1955-6*: a study of Pap. Ox. xx. 2251; perhaps Dia's lament for her father Deioneus killed by Ixion after a quarrel. G. Andresen, *Pap. Ox. xx. 2256, fr. 10(a)*: appears to be relevant to Phineus and the Harpyes; probably a fragment of the Phineus. A. Giannini, *Platone comico e la commedia attica sulla fine del V sec.*: follows the dramatic development of Plato and estimates his importance in the transition from Old to Middle Comedy. G. L. Luzzatto, *L'Antigone di Carl Orff*: an appreciation of Orff's opera, with special reference to its literary qualities and relation to Sophocles. G. Schiassi, *La Comedia Florentina e la sua attribuzione alle Koniazomenai di Menandro*: the *Κωνιαζόμεναι* fragment alone fits the dramatic situation inferred from the Com. Flor.; on the basis of these texts and the title a more detailed reconstruction of the plot is attempted. A. M. Scarcella, *Lecture Euripide: l'Oreste' e il problema dell'unità*: finds the unity of the play confirmed by a number of recurrent themes and by a consistent treatment of the main character; rejects the comic elements seen by some in the latter part of the play. D. Del Corno, *P. Ox. 2256, 3 e le rappresentazioni postume di Eschilo*: re-examines evidence for later productions of Aeschylus' plays in relation to this fragment. G. L. Luzzatto, *'Ifigenia in Tauride' di Gluck alla Scala*: Gluck, whose aim is to make his music serve the poetry, has remained faithful to the Euripidean characters.

### XX (New Series), 1-2 (1957)

B. Pace, *L'Istituto del Dramma e gli studi sul teatro antico*: introductory address to the

Corso di Cultura Classica at Syracuse, January 1953. A. Pertusi, *Selezione teatrale e scelta erudita nella tradizione del testo di Euripide*, iii: *La ricomparsa di Euripide nel medio evo bizantino*: follows the history of the two selections through the papyri into Byzantine times; in the case of Euripides, unlike the other dramatists, production of the plays in post-classical times was of prime importance for the early history of his text. N. Petruzzellis, *Aristofane e la sofistica*: Aristophanes' satire is not that of a moralist or reformer; his attack on the Sophists does not mean that he is free from their influence. A. Garzya, *Studi sugli 'Eracidi' di Euripide*, ii: *Problemi del testo*: questions of text and interpretation at 2-3, 150-2, 176-8, 220-3, 385-7, 540-1, 549-51, 733, 837-8, 970. G. L. Luzzatto, *Claudel traduttore di Eschilo*: Claudel's versions are a re-creation rather than a translation of Aeschylus. C. Ferrari, *Saggio di versione poetica*: a translation of Eur. *Hecuba* 342-582, 905-942. G. L. Luzzatto, *Sofocle e Kierkegaard: l'Antigone moderna*: a study of Kierkegaard's meditations on Sophocles, especially *Antigone*.

## ERANOS

### LV. 3-4 (1957)

M. P. Nilsson discusses the personifications of *Ἐναιυρός*—Annu in art. L. Bergson concludes that the dictionary entry s.v. *κωπητήρ* should read: 1. = *τροπωτήρ*, Hermipp. 54 Kock; 2. gunwale, Agathias 5. 21, cf. Pollux 1. 92. There is no evidence for an equation with *σκαλμός*. A. J. Festugière, *Euripide dans les Bacchantes*, finds the essence of the play in the first 900 lines, where he considers that Euripides makes of Dionysus a symbol of the peace of the soul won by simplicity of heart. F. Rundgren, *Zur Bedeutung von οἰκονομία* in 3 *Esra* 3, 1, argues from the context and from parallels in oriental languages that the meaning must be 'prince of the blood'. N. I. Herescu explains the difficulties presented by Catullus 66, 77-78, and argues that no offence to scansion or sense is to be found in his solution, viz. *quicum ego, dum uirgo quondam fuit, hominis exors, | umquentorum una milia multa bibi*. R. Syme writes on echoes of Sallust in Tacitus, and claims, on the basis of *artissimo diuortio* in Ann. xii. 63, that *angustissimo diuortio* in Schol. Juvenal x. 1 is taken from Sallust's

description of the Straits of Gades passed by Sertorius. S. Å. Blomgren continues his notes on the text of Valerius Maximus. E. Wistrand develops Löfstedt's observations on the use of *praestare* to mean *beneficium, officium, obsequium praestare*, not only giving much material from inscriptions and late authors, but also finding instances in Martial, Statius, and Seneca (*Phoenix* 180, a passage dealt with at length). R. M. Ogilvie suggests that Livy may have initiated the use of *caput* to mean the mouth of a river, under the influence of a Polybian κεφαλῆς (xxxiii. 41. 7, xxxvii. 18. 6). F. W. Lenz proposes to read *Andromache*(s) and *Euadne*(s) in *Consolatio ad Liviam* 319, 321.

## HERMATHENA

## LXXXV (MAY 1955)

B. Farrington, *The Meaning of Persona in De Rerum Natura* iii. 58: *persona* is to be understood here in its judicial, not its theatrical, signification. E. Courtney, *A Note on Statius, Silvae* 1. 5. 36-9: follows Housman in placing 37-38 before 39, and in 39 reads *quoque Tyri invidias licet et Sidonia, rupes*. Sir John Miles, *On Demosthenes, Contra Spudiam*: discusses some legal problems in this speech. W. B. Stanford, *On a Recent Interpretation of the Tragic Katharsis*: shows that Moulinier's interpretation (in *La pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs d'Homère à Aristote*, 1952) had been anticipated by W. F. Trench in 1930. Trench's main contention being that the katharsis consisted in a restoration of emotional harmony in the spectator. R. G. Ussher, *On Aristophanes, Frogs* 954 ff.: suggests σπράψεν ἔδρα (cf. Theophrastus, *Characters* 27. 21 and Theocritus 24. 111).

## LXXXVI (November 1955)

A. Dalzell, *C. Asinius Pollio and the Early History of Public Recitation at Rome*: suggests that Pollio's innovation (as referred to in Seneca, *Controv.* iv. *pref.* 2) was to establish public recitations on a more formal basis, giving them the character they retained under the Empire; Pollio may have used the Atrium Libertatis for this purpose. W. B. Stanford, *Recent Studies in the Classical Tradition*: discusses recent publications and developments. L. J. D. Richardson, *Further Observations on Homer and the Mycenaean Tablets*: compares Homer's methods of listing domestic objects and armour with lists in the tablets, and notes that when Homer describes certain kinds of action (as in *Od.* xii. 35-65) he uses very few adjectives,

producing an effect something like that of the Mycenaean 'operation orders'; the germ of the 'rhopaloid' line may, perhaps, be seen in some of the noun-adjective groupings in the tablets; there is a remarkable similarity in the attitudes to craftsmanship expressed in the Homeric poems and in the Mycenaean records.

## LXXXVII (MAY 1956)

W. Beare, *The Origin of Rhythmic Latin Verse*: surveys recent theories, analyses some examples, and suggests that the demand for rhyme and rhythm came mainly from the emergent vernacular languages and the new music, together with the spirit of the medieval age. N. Rudd, *Horace and Fannius*: discusses Horace, *Sat.* i. 4 and concludes that Fannius was the donor, not the recipient, of the objects mentioned in v. 22; Horace had not yet published any poems of his own at that time. R. G. Ussher, *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* 905-9: places a comma after κάρωντρον and translates 'They kindle and send . . . a great beard of fire and a mirror of the Saronic Gulf, to pass over Pron, beaming onward'; and produces arguments in favour of retaining φλέγοντα. W. R. Smyth, *Propertiana*: comments on eighty-one notes of Shackleton Bailey. L. V. D. Richardson, *Homer, Odyssey* xii. 212, again: gives some further possible interpretations, rejecting the view that the meaning is similar to Virgil's *foras et hanc olim meminisse iuvabit*, which he queried in *Hermathena* lxxxiii (1954).

## LXXXVIII (NOVEMBER 1956)

W. S. Maguinness, *Seneca and the Poets*: notes some recent revival of interest in the poetry of the younger Seneca, and examines his views on the poets and his use of poetic material in his *Epistles*; Seneca's approach to poetry is that of a somewhat doctrinaire philosopher—enthusiastic but utilitarian.

## LXXXIX (MAY 1957)

E. A. Thompson, *Slavery in Early Germany*: examines the meagre evidence for the period from c. 50 B.C. to A.D. 400; and concludes that slave labour was sporadic and exceptional in pre-Migration Germany. R. G. Ussher, *A Comment on Unmixed Milk*: justifies the epithet ἀκραιφν in *Odyssey* ix. 297 in the sense of unsweetened (cf. μελικραρον). W. B. Stanford, *Notes on Aristophanes's Frogs*: argues (a) for the production of the Lenaeon plays in the Theatre of Dionysus, (b) for the meaning 'each time they introduce baggage-carriers'

in v. 15, (c) for taking *πῶτος* (v. 139) as 'war slang', (d) for a new interpretation of vv. 814-29, (e) for reading *ἐκείνους* 'in that way' in v. 1144, (f) for taking *ἔπος* as 'word' or 'phrase' and not as 'line' throughout the *Frogs*. L. J. D. Richardson, *Aeschylus, Persae* 135: explains ἀβροτερθεῖς and supports Paley's reading.

# XC (NOVEMBER 1957)

N. Rudd, *Horace, Sermones* ii. 1: analyses the personal motives underlying the poem; Horace is ambiguously brandishing an olive branch and a sword in a deliberately ridiculous exhibition of *Scheinpolemik*; he was conscious that his satires lacked the element of vigorous personal attack which marked the Lucilian *satura*.

## MNEMOSYNE

### 4TH SERIES XI (1958), Fasc. I

J. Gonda, 'Prolepsis' of the Adjective in Greek and other Ancient Indo-European Languages: there is a tendency wrongly or doubtfully to describe as 'proleptic' adjectives, especially Gk., which (like *ἐπὶ*) form a syntagma with a verb, or are pleonastic, or serve the function of an adv. in modern languages; for many uses there are Skt. and other I.E. parallels; the term prolepsis is best confined to the attributive adj., as Soph. Tr. 106 οὐκ ὄντων ἐνδύειν ἀδελφόντων βλεφάρων νόθου, Ov. Met. i. 184 *incitare* . . . *captive brachia caelo*. W. J. Verdenius, *Hesiod Theogony* 35: ἀλλὰ τίς μοι ταῦτα περὶ θρόνῳ ἢ περὶ πέτρῃ; means 'but why this enlarging on my private affairs?'; the phrase ἀπὸ θρόνῳ ἢ ἀπὸ πέτρῃ, based on the belief that the first men originated from trees and rocks, denotes (1) the question of descent, (2) revelation of private affairs. J. C. Kamerbeek, *De Sophoclis memoria*: although A (Paris. 2712), with its twins UY, depends in *Aj.*, *El.*, *O.T.* to some extent on Moschopoulos, it contains many independent readings, and Turyn is wrong in considering it valueless in those plays. D. Holwerda, *De novo primum Aristophanis Nubium indicio*: discusses the text not only of *Argum.* vi but of schol. Vat. Barb. 126 on *Clouds* 1115; the latter is almost certainly by Heliodorus (end of 1st cent. A.D.), who implies a lacuna at this point and refers to his commentary on the first *Clouds*; thus the second *Clouds* must have differed from the first not only in the parabasis but elsewhere. H. J. Rose, *Second Thoughts on Hyginus*: thirty-seven additions or corrections to R's edition (1934). H. M. Currie,

*Lucan* iii 8 ff. and *Silius Italicus* xvii 158 ff.: in the L. passage read *inde sopore fero cessarunt languida somno*; S. has *et fero ductoris turbabant somnia mentem*, and 60 lines later imitates *Lucan* iii. 3-4. H. Wagenvoort, *Ad Lucr.* 5. 911 sq.: this Roman allusion to jewels growing on trees should be added before examples given in W.'s *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (1956), p. 277. W. J. Verdenius, *Odyssey* xiv. 338: defends γέγονας ἐνι, 'arrive at', and explains ἐνι as 'still more completely'. W. J. W. Koster, *Thomas Magister ad Ar. Plut.* 631: a correction to K.'s *Auteur d'un manuscrit d'Aristophane* (1957). W. J. W. Koster, *De Synesii Hymn. vi-viii metro*: the metre of these hymns (old numbering vii-ix) is not Telesillean but anapaestic.

## RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

### C. 4 (1957)

W. Schmid, *Contritio* and 'ultima linea rerum' in *neuen epikureischen Texten*: Philod. *Pragmat.* col. 18, 5 D. *συρριπτή* = *contritio cordis*. In the inscription from Aquincum published by L. von Nagy (*Arch. Ertz.* 1938/9, 118) *non certo limite cretas* is to be taken as a reference to the *ultima linea rerum*, which is certain in that it will occur, but uncertain in its manner and time. H. Herter, *Bewegung der Materie bei Platon*: there is only such motion as is directed by the soul. E. Bickel, *Critica in Senecae Epistulas*: *Archetypi menda in libro i tolluntur*, discusses 4. 3, 9; 5. 4; 9. 9; 10. 1; 11. 1, 5; 13. 7; 15. 3. E. Vogt, *Zu den Hymnen des Neuplatonikers Proklos*: notes on i. 5, 31, 46; iv. 4; vii. 51; xi. 10 and vii. 42; vii. 98; fr. ii. W. Jaeger, *Adverbiale Verstärkung des präpositionalen Elements von Verbalkomposita in griechischen Dichtern*: at Solon fr. 24. 16 (Diehl) read *ἐνυοῖ*, and for the pleonastic adverb cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 793, 1210, *I.T.* 1179, *I.A.* 476, *Suppl.* 331, 569; read at Aesch. *P.V.* 354 *πάλιν ὅς ἀνέστη* and cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 544-5; read at Eur. *Her.* 385-7 *πῶς δ' ἀργυροπότηρας ἔβρου διε-|πῶσαν ἐχθρῶν*. A. Y. Campbell, *Horace* *serm.* II vii 75-83, transposes 78 before 75. V. Pisani, *Zwei thrakische Beiträge*: rejects the change I.E. *bh* > *Mys.* *m* and refers *παρ-|δάει* to \**mant-akā*; Thrac. *Ζεφύρη*, Osc. *Herentās*, Gk. *χαίρω*, Skr. *haryati* are cognates. G. C. Whittick, *Echion's Son and his Tutor*: punctuates Petronius 46. 3-8 *nec uno loco consistit, sed venit, den litteras*, sed 'non vult laborare', and takes it to be inconsistent criticism of Echion's son by his tutor. F. Hornstein, *Zu Sallust. Epist. ad Caes. ii, 7, 3*: reads *patriae ciuibz parentibus liberis*.



RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E  
DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA

N.S. XXXV (1957): 4

(337) A. Momigliano, *L'opera storica di Gaetano De Sanctis*: gives an account of De Sanctis's career as an ancient historian and an appreciation of his influence as a writer and teacher. (354) G. Tarditi, *Euripide e il dramma di Medea*: analyses the *Medea*, and seeks to show that Euripides was influenced by the consequences of Pericles' law limiting Athenian citizenship to the legitimate children of citizens. (372) A. Colonna, *Giulio Cesare di Moerbeke e l'esemplare Φ della Poetica di Aristotele*: offers some preliminary notes, which he hopes will be helpful to a future editor, on the problem of reconstructing the Greek text which Moerbeke used for his literal Latin version of the *Poetics*. (382) E. Aucello, *La politica dei Diadochi e l'ultimatum del 314 av. Cr.*: discusses the ultimatum which was sent to Antigonus in 314 by Cassander, Lysimachus, and Ptolemy and argues that in Diodorus' account of the ultimatum (xix. 57. 1) ἡ δόλον καταδοκῶν μὲν καὶ Ἀνδῶν Κασάνδρου δοθήναι should be read (most editors prefer Ἀνδῶν for Ἀνδῶν).

TRANSACTIONS OF THE  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATION

VOL. LXXXVII (1956)

A. Parry, *The Language of Achilles*: formulaic epic style describes things as they are generally viewed, making no distinction between appearance and reality. Hence Achilles' disillusionment in *Il.* ix and xvi can only be expressed by 'misusing the language he disposes of'. D. J. Conacher, *Religious and Ethical Attitudes in Euripides' Suppliants*: Euripides' alleged orthodoxy here is more apparent than real. Theseus acts from ethical, not religious, considerations, sneers at the Delphic Oracle, and conveys the impression of wanton gods. The final portion of the play includes ironic treatment of the punishment of *hybris* and the justice of the gods. F. M. Wassermann, *Post-Periclean Democracy in Action: The Mytilenean Debate*: an exposition of Thuc. iii. 37-48. H. L. Levy, *Property Distribution by Lot in present-day Greece*: such distribution of inherited property survives as an extra-legal and peculiarly Greek practice in Boeotia. F. Sokolowski, *On the Lex Sacra of Tymnos*: the occasion referred to in lines 4-7 is a wedding, with its two distinct

ceremonies. O. M. Pearl, *The Inundation of the Nile in the Second Century A.D.*: interprets the papyrus record of about a month's flood levels in two successive years. H. C. Youtie, *Brief Notes on Papyrus Texts*: eleven notes, six of them on receipts or requests for payment. A. Diller, *Pausanias in the Middle Ages*: traces the history of the text from the sixth to the fifteenth centuries, suggesting a series of unique codices copied one from another. E. T. Salmon, *The Resumption of Hostilities after the Caudine Forks*: in 316 B.C. Rome sent a force to recover Satricum in the Liris valley (not Saticula, as generally believed), and so gave the Samnites an excuse for ending the Caudine Peace. W. E. Gwatkin, Jr., *Some Reflections on the Battle of Pharsalus*: argues that the battle was fought south of the Enipeus, with the Pompeians arranged as Plutarch and Appian describe. Retreat was eastward, to the hill of Karadja Ahmet. F. O. Copley, *Catullus, c. 38*: not a 'deathbed poem', but a complaint that Cornificius had sent no word of sympathy (such as was due to Catullus' affection—*meos amores*) to the poet in his bereavement. We cannot say who it was who had died. W. Allen, Jr., *'O fortunatam natam...'*: Cicero's contemporaries would find nothing objectionable in the style or content of *O fortunatam...*; only later did it become traditional to laugh at it. We should perhaps read *te consule*. E. A. Hahn, *A Source of Vergilian Hypallage*: discusses Virgil's transfer of epithets for reasons of balance, metre, or variety and vividness, his inverted use of verbs of leaving, taking away, freeing, etc., and his illogical and extended uses of *cum inversum*. R. Pack, *The Sibyl in a Lamp*: Apuleius, *Met.* ii. 11 refers to the belief in a Sibyl confined in a flask or lamp. L. R. Shero, *Alcmena and Amphitryon in Ancient and Modern Drama*: lists fifty-five dramatic works in Greek, Latin, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese based on the Alcmena-Amphitryon story, giving some details of the plots, where known, and showing the fruitfulness of the theme both in tragedy and comedy. L. Casson, *The Isis and her Voyage: a Reply*: medieval evidence on sea-routes, adduced by Iserlin, *T.A.P.A.* lxxxvi, 319, is not valid, as pilgrim galleys had oars and were prepared to use them. H. R. Immerwahr, *Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus* (supplementary paper): finds three levels of causation in Herodotus—immediate, permanent, and metaphysical. But Herodotus 'has not made a system out of causation', believing as he did that it cannot be completely known to the historian. G. E. Duckworth, *Animas Dimidium Meas* (supplementary paper): traces the influence

of Virgil and Horace on each other, noting especially the parallelism between *Odes* iii. 1-6 and *Aeneid* vi. 760-853, the Virgilian

echoes in *Odes* iv, and the similarity of theme and treatment between works of these poets and the *Ara Paris*.

## NOTES AND NEWS

SOPHOCLES' *Antigone* will be performed in Greek by members of the University at the Arts Theatre, Cambridge, at 2.15 on 24-28 Feb. 1959; also on the 25th at 8.0, 26th at 5.0, 27th at 8.0, 28th at 8.15. Producer: Alan Ker. Music: Peter Tranchell.

The Third International Congress of Classical Studies will be held in London from 31 August to 5 September 1959. The general theme proposed is 'Tradition and Achievement: New and Old in Classical Antiquity'; it is intended also to celebrate the centenary of Housman's birth and the bicentenary of Porson's. The meetings will be held in the Senate House of the University of London; excursions, official receptions, and exhibitions have been arranged. Details of the programme will be sent out in January to those who inform the Secretary (Dr. V. L. Ehrenberg, Institute of Classical Studies, 31-34 Gordon Square, W.C. 1) of their intention to attend.

The proceedings of the Second International Congress of Classical Studies (Copenhagen, 1954)—the Madvig Congress—have been published in five volumes. Volumes ii-v are concerned with the basic themes of the Congress—the classical pattern of modern Western Civilization in Forms of Thought, Town-Planning, Portraiture, and Language respectively. Volume i contains the papers which did not fall under these headings—on Madvig himself, the Mycenaean script, music, mathematics, law, and archaeology.

The proceedings of the First Spanish Congress of Classical Studies (Madrid, 1956) appear in one large volume of nearly 600 pages. Many of the eighty papers which were read at the Congress are represented by summaries: among the longer contributions are three on Archilochus and Hipponax in the light of recent papyrological and epigraphic discoveries (F. R. Adrados), Martial (J. M. Pabón), and Medieval Spanish Latin (M. C. Díaz y Díaz).

The *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations*, of which the first number appears this year, is designed 'to provide the universities of the African Continent with a classical journal of their own'. It is intended to produce one number a year, in August: the price is 16s. Articles, books for review, and subscriptions should be sent to the Managing Editor, University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Salisbury, Rhodesia. In vol. i four articles came from Africa—T. F. Carney, 'The Aims of Roman Military and Foreign Policy in the Last Quarter of the Third Century B.C.', K. D. White, 'Local Government Then and Now', J. Ferguson, 'Catullus and Propertius', L. A. W. Yehya, 'The Athenian Ephebeia towards the End of the Fourth Century B.C.'; the others are by E. Badian, 'Notes on Provincial Governors from the Social War down to Sulla's Victory', H. Mattingly, 'The Roman Goddess of War', T. B. L. Webster, 'Sophocles and the *Antigone*', R. Sealey, 'Athens and the Archidamian War'.

The two largest constituents in the latest half-volume of Pauly-Wissowa, viii. A. 2 (Stuttgart: Druckenmüller), are the continuation of K. Büchner's article on Virgil (which will be published separately) and that on the Winds (80 pp.) by R. Böker and H. Gundel. Other long items are Verres (Habermehl), Verrius Flaccus (A. Dihle), Vertumnus (W. Eichenhut) and Vesta (C. Koch), the Verginii and the Vettii, *vicus* and *villa* (A. W. van Buren), *vicarius* (W. Ensslin, K. Schneider) and *vidua* (T. Mayer-Maly), and supplementary articles on Velia, Velitrae, Verona, and Vesuvius (G. Radke),  *vexillum* (A. R. Neumann), *vicesima* (G. Wesener), Victor and Victoria (S. Weinstock), and *vigintiviri* (H. Schaefer).

Useful and attractive 'paper-back' reprints of standard works long out of print continue to come from America. Dover Publications send Bury's *History of the Later Roman Empire* (two vols.: \$2 each); Harpers reprint, as *The Emergence of Christian Culture in the West* (\$1.75), Henry Osborn Taylor's *Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*, and, as *The Triumph of Christendom in the Roman Empire* (\$1.85), chapters xv-xx of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* with Bury's notes and appendixes.

Two volumes of *Lustrum*, the successor to Bursian, have now appeared. Volume i contains surveys of work on Homer, 1930-56 (H. J. Mette), Greek Archaeology and Literature, 1951-5 (T. B. L. Webster), and Post-Augustan Poetry, i (Maecenas to Martial) (R. Helm). Volume ii has Greek Metric, 1936-57 (A. M. Dale), Aristophanes, 1938-55 (K. J. Dover), Seneca, *Tragedies*, 1922-55 (M. Coffey), Post-Augustan Poetry i (continued: R. Helm), and Post-Augustan Poetry ii (Hadrian to Boethius) (L. Bieler).

Articles on classical subjects written in Esperanto are something of a novelty. *Sciencaj Studoj*, published by the International Scientific Association of Esperantists (Copenhagen, 1958), contains two such; Dr. E. Vilborg of the University of Gothenburg discusses the affiliation of the manuscripts of 'Longus', and Professor J. R. Pérez of the University of La Laguna identifies the Garden of the Hesperides and Mount Atlas with the Canaries and the volcanic Pic de Ténériffe. In another article in the same collection Dr. H. Sirk, formerly Professor of Physics at Vienna, holds out hope that some sort of reproduction of the sounds of dead languages may be recoverable if objects of tin or amber decorated with a pointed instrument on a lathe or a wheel have acted as fortuitous phonographic records by registering the vibrations due to human utterances accompanying the process.

In these days when translation from English into Latin verse is becoming a rare pursuit even among professional scholars in this country, it is refreshing to find the art being cultivated by an amateur at the other end of the world. *A Garland of the Muses* is a privately printed collection of versions (mostly in elegiacs) by a Ceylonese judge, Mr. L. W. de Silva, a former president of the Classical Association of Ceylon, who has added this accomplishment to the classical training he had at St. Thomas' College, Colombo, and by making it the pastime of a busy official life has (as he puts it) 'reaped the harvest of his youthful joys'. As Sir Richard Livingstone says in a foreword, it is a notable achievement; it is also a good example.

The Triennial Joint Meeting of Greek and Roman Societies was held in Cambridge from 7 to 14 August 1958. Some 380 persons attended, and the participants included a number of distinguished scholars from overseas, though somewhat fewer than in the past, mainly because many were already engaged to attend the London Congress of 1959. The readers of papers were: A. D. Nock (Posidonius); G. T. Griffith (Isegoria and Athenian Democracy); R. G. Austin (Virgil and the Wooden Horse); G. S. Kirk (The Unseen and the Improbable in Greek Philosophy); L. P. Wilkinson (The Language of Virgil and Horace); Signora P. Zancani-Montuoro (The Terra-Cotta Relief Plaques from Locri Epizephyrii); M. I. Finley (Was Greek Civilization based on Slave Labour?); K. Latte (Archilochus); E. S. Staveley (The Censorship of Appius Claudius Caecus); D. Daube (The Use of *Reductio ad Absurdum* by the Roman Jurists); H. Lloyd-Jones (Modern Interpretations of Greek Tragedy (particularly Euripides)); I. A. Richmond (Roman Military Hospitals); J. R. Bambrough (Plato's Modern Friends and Enemies); K. Hanell (The Session of the Senate on Non. Dec. 63 B.C. and the Fourth Catilinarian Speech); H. G. Beyen (Roman Wall-Painting, c. 50-25 B.C.); Homer A. Thompson (Athenian Twilight).

The members were received and addressed at a reception in the Old Schools by the Master of Peterhouse, deputizing for the Vice-Chancellor. A garden party was held for them by the generosity of the Master and Fellows of Peterhouse, and excursions were undertaken to Norwich, Hengrave Hall, Luton Hoo, and Wicken Fen.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.*

- Acta Congressus Madvigiani*. Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Classical Studies, 1954. Vol. i: General Part (Madvig, Languages of Prehistoric Greece, Music and Learning, Religion, Law, Archaeology). Pp. 445. Vol. ii: The Classical Pattern of Western Civilization—Formation of the Mind, Forms of Thought, Moral Ideas. Pp. 225. Vol. iii: The Classical Pattern of Western Civilization—Portraiture. Pp. 99. Vol. iv: The Classical Pattern of Western Civilization—Urbanism and Town Planning. Pp. 129. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1958. Paper, kr. 65, 35, 25, 30. Vol. v: The Classical Pattern of Western Civilization—Language. Pp. 235. Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag, 1958. Paper, kr. 35.
- Actas del Primer Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, April 1956). Pp. xxi + 620. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 1958. Paper, 200 ptas.
- Adams (S. M.) *Sophocles the Playwright*. Pp. ix + 182. (The Phoenix, Supplementary Vol. iii.) Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Paper, 38s. net.
- Alcroft (A. H.), Mason (W. F.) *The Tutorial History of Rome*. Revised and rewritten by C. E. Robin, E. E. Doherty, and B. R. I. Sealey. Sixth Edition. Pp. v + 390. London: University Tutorial Press, 1958. Cloth, 9s. 6d.
- Allen (P. S.), Flower (B.) *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami*. Tom. xii: Indices. Compilavit B. F. Pp. iv + 189. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 42s. net.
- American Philological Association: Transactions and Proceedings*. Vol. lxxvii (1956). Pp. vi + 316 + lvi. Lancaster, Pa. (to be obtained in Great Britain from B. H. Blackwell, Oxford), 1955. Cloth.
- Badian (E.) *Foreign Clientelae* (264-70 B.C.). Pp. xi + 342. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Baglio (G.) *Odisseo nel Mare Mediterraneo Centrale secondo i libri v e ix-xii dell'Odissea*. Seconda edizione ampliata ed



- illustrata. Pp. 153. Rome: Bretschneider, 1958. Paper, L. 1,400.
- Barnard (M.)** Sappho: a new translation. Pp. x+114. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1958. Stiff paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Beazley (J. D.)** *Edrys Anaktoria*. (From Proc. of the Brit. Acad., xliii.) Pp. 12; 6 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Bennett (E. L.)** The Mycenae Tablets, II. With an introduction by A. J. B. Wace and E. B. Wace; translations and commentary by J. Chadwick. Pp. 122. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1958. Paper, \$3.
- Bieder (L.)** Boethii Philosophiae Consolatio. (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, xciv.) Pp. xxviii+124. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1957. Paper, 150 B. fr.
- Bömer (F.)** P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten. Band ii: Kommentar. Pp. 427. Heidelberg: Winter, 1957. Paper, DM. 44.
- Bolaffi (E.)** La critica filosofica e letteraria in Quintiliano. (Collection Latomus, xxx.) Pp. 62. Brussels: Latomus, 1958. Paper, 90 B. fr.
- Broscher (C.)** Analysen zu Suetons Divus Julius und der Parallelüberlieferung. (Noctes Romanae, 8.) Pp. 146. Bern: Haupt, 1958. Paper, 13.40 Sw. fr.
- Buchheit (V.)** Studien zu Methodios von Olympos. (Texte u. Untersuch. zur Gesch. der althristlichen Literatur, Bd. 69.) Pp. xvi+181. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958. Paper, DM. 22.50.
- Buchner (E.)** Der Panegyrikos des Isokrates: eine historisch-philologische Untersuchung. (Historia Einzelschriften, 2.) Pp. x+170. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1958. Paper, DM. 15.
- Bury (J. B.)** History of the Later Roman Empire, from the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian. 2 vols. Pp. xxv+471; ix+494. New York: Dover Publications (London: Constable), 1958. Paper, £1. 12s. [Reprint: first published 1923.]
- Cardini (M. T.)** Pitagorici: Testimonianze e Frammenti. Fasc. i. Pp. xix+177. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 2,000.
- Carpenter (R.)** Folk Tale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics. (Sather Classical Lectures.) Pp. 198. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1958. Stiff paper, 13s. 6d. net. [Reprint: first published in 1946: see C.R. lvi. 14.]
- Cerfaux (L.), Tondriou (J.)** Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine. (Bibliothèque de Théologie, iii. 5.) Pp. 535. Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1958. Paper.
- Chadwick (J.)** The Decipherment of Linear B. Pp. x+147; 2 plates, 17 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.
- Clay (D. M.)** A Formal Analysis of the Vocabularies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. ii: Classified Lists. Pp. 175. Athens: privately printed, 1958. Paper.
- Coccia (M.)** I problemi del De Ira di Seneca alla luce dell'analisi stilistica. Pp. 155. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1958. Paper, L. 1,600.
- Cushman (R. E.)** Therapeia: Plato's Conception of Philosophy. Pp. xxii+322. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 48s. net.
- de Romilly (J.)** La crainte et l'angoisse dans le théâtre d'Eschyle. (Coll. d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 123. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958. Paper.
- De Sanctis (G.)** Storia dei Romani. Vol. iv, Parte seconda, Torno ii. Pp. viii+125. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 1,300.
- De Selincourt (A.)** Arrian's Life of Alexander the Great. A new translation. Pp. 256. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1958. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers.** No. 11. Pp. ix+277; 44 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 60s. net.
- Esser (A.)** Cäsar und die julisch-claudischen Kaiser im biologisch-ärztlichen Blickfeld. Pp. 270; 44 figs. Leiden: Brill, 1958. Cloth, fl. 45.
- Études d'Archéologie classique**, i: 1955-6. (Annales de l'Est, publ. par la Fac. des Lettres de l'Univ. de Nancy, Mém. 19.) Pp. 167; 29 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1958. Paper.
- Felletti Maj (B. M.)** Iconografia Romana Imperiale da Severo Alessandro a M. Aurelio Carino (222-285 d. C.) Pp. 309; 60 plates. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1958. Paper, L. 11,000.
- Fernandez (L. G.)** Platon: Fedro. Edición bilingüe, traducción, notas y estudio preliminar. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. lxxvii+83 (double). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1957. Paper, 150 ptas.
- Fuller (J. F. C.)** The Generalship of Alexander the Great. Pp. 319; 3 plates, 21 maps. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Gabba (E.)** Appiani Bellorum Civilium liber primus. Introduzione, testo critico, e commento con traduzione e indici. Pp. xlii+

444. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 4,500.
- Gardner (R.) (1) Cicero: Pro Sestio and In Vatinius; (2) Cicero: Pro Caelio, De Provinciis Consularibus, Pro Balbo. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xx+374; xx+376-759. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net each.
- Gentili (B.) Anacreonte. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione, studio sui frammenti papiracei. Pp. xliii+218. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1958. Cloth, L. 4,000.
- González (C. S.) El Apéndice Virgiliano. (Univ. del Ecuador, Publ. del Inst. Sup. de Humanidades Clásicas, vol. ii.) Pp. 176. Quito: Editorial Clásica, 1958. Paper.
- Gordon (A. E.) Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions, Part i: Rome and the Neighbourhood, Augustus to Nerva. Text: pp. 160. Plates: 67, in portfolio. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1958. Cloth: 2 vols., £5. 12s. 6d.
- Grant (M.), Pottinger (D.) Greeks. Pp. 63. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1958. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Green (R. L.) Old Greek Fairy Tales. With illustrations by E. H. Shephard. Pp. 186. London: Bell, 1958. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Grene (D.), Lattimore (R.) The Complete Greek Tragedies. Euripides, iii: Andromache, Trojan Women, Ion, translated with introductions by J. F. Nims, R. Lattimore, R. F. Willetts. Pp. 255. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1958. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Gschütz (F.) Abhängige Orte im griechischen Altertum. (Zetemata, Heft 17.) Pp. 196. Munich: Beck, 1958. Paper, DM. 22.
- Hagendahl (H.) Latin Fathers and the Classics. A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and other Christian writers. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, vi.) Pp. 424. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958. Paper, kr. 28.
- Harmand (L.) Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au bas-empire. (Publ. de la Fac. des Lett. de l'Univ. de Clermont, 2 ser., fasc. 2.) Pp. 552. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958. Paper, 2,000 fr.
- Houland (R. H.) The Athenian Agora, Volume iv: Greek Lamps and their Survivals. Pp. ix+252; 56 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1958. Cloth, \$12.50.
- Hubaux (J.) Rome et Véies: recherches sur la chronologie légendaire du moyen âge romain. (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, fasc. cxlv.) Pp. 406; 10 plates. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957. Paper, fr.
- Kassel (R.) Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur. (Zetemata, Heft 18.) Pp. xii+107. Munich: Beck, 1958. Paper, DM. 12.
- Kießling (A.), Heinze (R.) Q. Horatius Flaccus: Satiren. Sechste Auflage. Mit einem Nachwort und bibliographischen Nachträgen von Erich Burck. Pp. xlv+413. Berlin: Weidmann, 1958. Cloth, DM. 14.
- Kleinlogel (A.) Beobachtung zu einigen 'recentiores' des Thukydides. (Sitz. der Heidelb. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1957. 1.) Pp. 60. Heidelberg: Winter, 1958. Paper, DM. 9.50.
- Künze (E.) VI. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia (Winter 1953-54 und 1954-55). Pp. iii+225; 83 plates. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1958. Paper, DM. 48.
- Kurfess (A.) Appendix Sallustiana. Fasc. 2: Invidiae. Editio tertia emendata et aucta. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. x+30. Leipzig: Teubner, 1958. Paper, DM. 3.
- Labourt (J.) Saint Jérôme: Lettres. Tome vi (Ep. cx-cxx). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 169 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958. Paper.
- Lambert (J. N.) Aspects de la Civilisation à l'âge du Patriarcat. Étude d'histoire juridique et religieuse comparée. (Bibl. de la Fac. du Droit de l'Univ. d'Alger, vol. xxviii.) Pp. 168. Algiers: Imprimerie Charry, 1958. Paper.
- Landau (O.) Mykenisch-Griechische Personennamen. Pp. 305. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, vii.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958. Paper, kr. 28.
- La Bonnière (H.) Le culte de Cérès à Rome des origines à la fin de la République. (Études et Commentaires, xxvii.) Pp. 507. Paris: Klincksieck, 1958. Paper.
- Lefherz (F.) Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz: Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten. Pp. 311. 1958. Obtainable from the author at Richrathstr. 9, Düsseldorf-Wersten. Paper, DM. 4.50.
- Lesky (A.) Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Lieferung 10/11. Pp. 577-704. Bern: Francke, 1957. Paper, 9.20, Sw. fr.
- Lind (L. R.) Ecclesiae: by Alexander of Villa Dei. Edited and translated, with an introduction and notes. Pp. x+155. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1958. Cloth, \$4.
- Meier (P.) Textual Criticism. Translated

- from the German by B. Flower. Pp. 59. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Mansion* (A.) *Aristoteles Latinus*, vii. 1: *Physica*—Translatio Vaticana. Pp. xvi+43. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957. Paper, 75 B. fr.
- Marcovich* (M.) *M. Marulfi Davidiadis libri xiv*. Pp. xxiv+270; 20 plates. Merida, Venezuela: Dirección de Cultura, Universidad de Los Andes, 1957. Paper.
- Marinone* (N.) *Cicerone: De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*. Pp. xxviii+328. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 800.
- Marlow* (N.) *A. E. Housman, Scholar and Poet*. Pp. viii+192. London: Routledge, 1958. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Marti* (B. M.) *Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule super Lucanum*. (Papers and Monographs, vol. xviii.) Pp. lxxvi+599. Rome: American Academy, 1958. Paper.
- Martin* (V.) *Papyrus Bodmer II. Supplément: Évangile de Jean*, chap. 14-21. Pp. 53. Cologny, Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958. Paper.
- Meander*. *Miesięcznik poświęcony kulturze świata starożytnego*. Rok xiii. 1, 2-3, 4, 5. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958. Paper, zł. 8, 18, 8, 8.
- Merone* (E.) *Sulla lingua di Valerio Flacco*. Pp. 118. Naples: Armanni, 1957. Paper, L. 1,000.
- Michell* (H.) *Economics of Ancient Greece*. Second edition. Pp. xi+427. Cambridge: Heffer, 1958. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Moritz* (L. A.) *Grain-Mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity*. Pp. xxvii+230; 16 plates, 16 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Norberg* (D.) *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*. (Studia Latina Stockholmensia, v.) Pp. 218. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958. Paper, kr. 26.
- Ovidiana* publiés à l'occasion du bimillénaire de la naissance du poète. Études, mémoires et notes inédites. Pp. 367. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958. Paper.
- Pagan* (M.) *La grecità politica da Tuciddide ad Aristotele*. Pp. 187. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1958. Paper, L. 3,000.
- Poncelet* (R.) *Cicéron traducteur de Platon. L'expression de la pensée complexe en Latin classique*. Pp. 401. Paris: De Boccard, 1957. Paper.
- Postgate* (J. P.) *Sermo Latinus. A short guide to Latin Prose Composition*. Pp. vii+186. London: Macmillan, 1958. Cloth, 7s. [Reprint of the edition of 1913.]
- Radt* (S. L.) *Pindars Zweiter und Sechster Paian: Text, Scholien und Kommentar*. Pp. 36+xi+213. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1958. Paper, fl. 20.
- Rambelli* (G.) *Comica Graeco-Latina*. Pp. 192. Pavia, 1958: Obtainable from the author at 14 Via Liguria, Pavia. Paper, L. 2,200.
- Richmond* (I. A.) (ed.) *Roman and Native in North Britain*. Pp. x+174. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1958. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Rico Gomez* (M.) *Jenofonte: La República de los Lacedemonios*. Edición, traducción y notas, con estudio preliminar. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. xli+26 (double). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1957. Paper, 50 ptas.
- Rico Gomez* (M.) *Platon: Criton*. Edición, traducción y notas, con estudio preliminar. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. xv+21 (double). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1957. Paper, 25 ptas.
- Roebuck* (R.) *Cornelius Nepos: Three lives—Alcibiades, Dion, Atticus*. (Alpha Classics.) Pp. vi+138; 8 plates, map. London: Bell, 1958. Cloth, 5s.
- Rose* (H. J.) *A Commentary on the surviving plays of Aeschylus*. Vol. ii (Oresteia). Pp. 299. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1958. Paper, fl. 25.
- Ruiz de Elvira* (A.) *Platon: Menon*. Edición bilingüe. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. lvii+68 (double). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1958. Paper, 200 ptas.
- Scholfeld* (A. F.) *Acilian: On Animals*. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Volume i (Books i-iv). Pp. xxix+359. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Seyffert* (O.) *A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*. Revised and edited by H. Nettleship and J. E. Sandys. Pp. vi+716. London: Allen and Unwin, 1958. Cloth, 30s. net. [Reprint of the last (third) edition of 1894.]
- Snell* (B.) *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*. Septimum edidit B. S. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. 61\*+132. Leipzig: Teubner, 1958. Cloth and boards, DM. 12.30.
- Stamford* (W. B.) *The Odyssey of Homer*. Edited with introductions, commentary and indexes. Volume ii (Books xiii-xxiv). Second edition. Pp. xciv+453. London: Macmillan, 1958. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Stroheker* (K. F.) *Dionysios I: Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus*. Pp. viii+264; 8 plates, map. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1958. Cloth, DM. 29.40.
- Sturm* (F.) *Abahenatio. Essai d'explication de la définition des Topiques* (Cic., Top. 5, 28). Pp. 225. Milan: A. Giuffrè, 1958. Paper, L. 1,200.

- Thomson (J. A. K.)** Gilbert Murray, 1866-1957. (From Proc. of the Brit. Acad., xliii.) Pp. 26. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Trypanis (C. A.)** Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and other Fragments. Text, translation and notes. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xvi+318. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Untersteiner (M.)** Parmenide: Testimonianze e Frammenti. Introduzione, traduzione e commento. Pp. ccx+184. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 4,500.
- Verde Castro (C. V.)** Dos Notas a Esquilo. (Textos y Estudios, 4.) Pp. 79. La Plata: Instituto de Lenguas Clásicas, 1958. Paper.
- Voegelin (E.)** Order and History. Vol. 2: The World of the Polis. Pp. xviii+389. Vol. 3: Plato and Aristotle. Pp. xvii+389. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 48s. net each.
- Wade-Gery (H. T.)** Essays in Greek History. Pp. xvi+301. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958. Cloth, 48s. net.
- Watt (W. S.)** M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae. Vol. iii: Ad Quintum Fratrem, Ad Brutum, Fragmenta. (Scr. Class. Bibl. Oxon.) Pp. 231. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Webster (T. B. L.)** From Mycenae to Homer. A Study in Early Greek Literature and Art. Pp. xv+312; 24 plates, map. London: Methuen, 1958. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Wind (E.)** Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance. Pp. 230; 50 plates. London: Faber, 1958. Cloth, 50s. net.



*Continued from p. 2 of cover*

*myceniennes*, D. M. JONES, 264; *Die Bergwerksklassen von Laurion*, II (Lauffer), A. R. W. HARRISON, 265; *Dion* (Berve), F. W. WALBRANT, 269; *Fortetsa* (Brock), R. M. COOK, 271; *Amazons in Greek Art* (von Bothmer), R. M. COOK, 272; *Ancient and Classical Architecture* (Ploemmer), M. SIMON, 273; *Greek Architecture* (Lawrence), W. H. PLOMMER, 276.

Short Reviews	280
Summaries of Periodicals	302
Notes and News	306
Books Received	308
Index	313

## The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bee School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

- Thomson* (J. A. K.) *Gilbert Murray, 1866-1957*. (From Proc. of the Brit. Acad., xliii.) Pp. 26. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Trypanis* (C. A.) *Callimachus: Actia, Iambi, Hecale and other Fragments*. Text, translation and notes. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xvi+318. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Untersteiner* (M.) *Farmenide: Testimonianze e Frammenti*. Introduzione, traduzione e commento. Pp. ccx+184. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 4,500.
- Verde Castro* (C. V.) *Dos Notas a Esquilo*. (Textos y Estudios, 4.) Pp. 79. La Plata: Instituto de Lenguas Clásicas, 1958. Paper.
- Voegelin* (E.) *Order and History*. Vol. 2: *The World of the Polis*. Pp. xviii+389. Vol. 3: *Plato and Aristotle*. Pp. xvii+389. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 48s. net each.
- Wade-Gery* (H. T.) *Essays in Greek History*. Pp. xvi+301. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958. Cloth, 48s. net.
- Watt* (W. S.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*. Vol. iii: *Ad Quintum Fratrem, Ad Brutum, Fragmenta*. (Scr. Class. Bibl. Oxon.) Pp. 231. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Webster* (T. B. L.) *From Mycenae to Homer. A Study in Early Greek Literature and Art*. Pp. xv+312; 24 plates, map. London: Methuen, 1958. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Wind* (E.) *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*. Pp. 230; 50 plates. London: Faber, 1958. Cloth, 50s. net.

*Continued from p. 2 of cover*

*mycéniennes*, D. M. JONES, 264; *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*, ii (Lauffer), A. R. W. HARRISON, 266; *Dion* (Berve), V. W. WALKER, 269; *Foriessa* (Brock), R. M. COOK, 271; *Amazons in Greek Art* (von Bothmer), R. M. COOK, 272; *Ancient and Classical Architecture* (Plommer), M. SIMON, 273; *Greek Architecture* (Lawrence), W. H. PLOMMER, 276.

Short Reviews	280
Summaries of Periodicals	302
Notes and News	306
Books Received	308
Index	313

## The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melluish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

## **ROMAN STOICISM**

*E. Vernon Arnold*

A reprint of this work, still the highest authority in the subject, has long been needed. 35s. net

## **ANCIENT MYCENAE**

*George E. Mylonas*

'A scholarly and balanced study of all the archaeological evidence which has come to light in Mycenae since 1871.' *Times Educational Supplement*. 45s. net

## **WINE IN THE ANCIENT WORLD**

*Charles Seltman*

'A learned diversion for a winter evening.'

*New Statesman*.

*Illustrated*

25s. net

---

Coming in the autumn

## **HOMER AND HIS CRITICS**

*Sir John L. Myres*

Dorothea Gray has edited these studies from the lectures given by the late Sir John L. Myres.

*Illustrated*

32s. net

## **PLATO: an introduction**

*Paul Friedländer*

The first of three separate but interconnected works, revised for the English version. Volume I. 35s. net

**ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL**